

Charles David Richards  
 Robert Charles Riese  
 Hugh Granville Robinson  
 Edward Earl Roderick  
 John Carl Rogers  
 Myron Warren Rose  
 Ralph Colby Ross, Jr.  
 William Charles Royals  
 Harry Franklin Ruhf  
 James Paul Ryan  
 Robert Bowles Sale, Jr.  
 Ronald Louis Salvador  
 Warren Alexander Samouce  
 Benjamin Franklin Schemmer  
 William Richard Schulz, 3d  
 Frederic Marvin Schweiger  
 Paul Schweikert, Jr.  
 James Lee Scovel  
 John Charles Shafer  
 Donald Palmer Shaw  
 Donald Shebat  
 John Raymond Shelter  
 Audrey John W. Short  
 Robert Benton Short, Jr.  
 Floyd Earl Sifferman, Jr.  
 Arthur Kenneth Sirkis  
 Lowell Ellis Sisson  
 Lawrence Franklin Skibble  
 James Hamilton Sloan, Jr.  
 James Henry Slogar  
 Quay Carlton Snyder  
 Craig Hamilton Spence  
 James Polk Spruill  
 Carl James Stark  
 John Melvin Stark, Jr.  
 Thomas Alfred Stark  
 Carl Richard Steimle  
 George Nelson Stenehjelm  
 Allan Charles Sterling, Jr.  
 Kennon Bailey Stewart  
 Robert Richard Stewart  
 Charles Stowe Stodter, Jr.  
 George Hileman Storck  
 Charles Earle Storrs, Jr.  
 Glen Wayne Stout  
 Herald Franklin Stout, Jr.  
 William Henry Stroh  
 Douglas Baird Stuart  
 Perry Louis Studt  
 Richard Harvey Sugg  
 John Anthony Sulk  
 Harry Edward Brook Sullivan  
 James Weldon Surber  
 John William Swarn, Jr.  
 Humbert Francis Sweeney  
 Robert Hugh Tawes  
 David Thomas Teberg  
 James Edward Thomas  
 Julius Octavius Thomas, Jr.  
 Bill Thomas Thompson  
 David Peter Thoreson  
 John Ernest Tilley  
 Jesse Richard Tippet, Jr.  
 Daniel James Tobin  
 Willis Clifton Tomsen  
 Lowell Edmund Toreson  
 Richard Wayne Townsley  
 LeRoy Clarence Turner  
 Richard Babcock Tyler  
 Andrew Fillebrown Underwood  
 Thomas Fraley Van Natta, Jr.  
 Gerald Edward Van Valkenburg  
 Dale Allen Vesser  
 Gerald Socrates Vigee  
 Newell Elliott Vinson  
 Louis Carson Wagner, Jr.  
 Prosper Newton Walker  
 Samuel Powell Walker 3d  
 William Lewis Wallace  
 Lewis Albert Waiser, Jr.  
 Fletcher Kirkland Ware, Jr.  
 Robert Jack Washer  
 Thomas Morgan Watlington 3d  
 William Jerome Weaver  
 Yale Duane Weatherby  
 Richard Legore Weaver  
 Robert Ernest Weeks  
 Robert William Wells  
 William Warren Welsh, Jr.

John Robinson Westervelt, Jr.  
 James Rufus Whitley  
 Herbert Evans Williams  
 James Arthur Williams  
 Larry Elliott Willner  
 William King Winston  
 John Anthony Wisniewski  
 Peter F. Witteried  
 Charles Donald Wood  
 Grayson Cooper Woodbury, Jr.  
 John Hawkins Woodyard  
 LuVern James Wooge  
 Don Joseph York  
 John Grey Young  
 Thomas Chambers Young  
 Richard George Ziegler

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 25, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.  
 The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp,  
 D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all grace and goodness, may our whole outlook upon life during this day be lifted far above and beyond the narrow horizons of selfish interest, personal aggrandizement, and material ambitions.

Grant that in our attitudes toward others we may have within our hearts that gracious and magnanimous spirit which leaps over every artificial barrier and transcends all surface differences.

Help us to be more eager and effective as we strive to carry into our international relationships the logic and blessedness of the principles of brotherhood and friendship.

May we do all within our power to inspire mankind with a longing for peace and good will for we are confident that nothing else can drive out the hatreds and prejudices and heal the divisions and hostilities between the nations of the earth.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1345. An act for the relief of John Lampropoulos;  
 H. R. 1705. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Jesse Bell;  
 H. R. 1772. An act for the relief of Kenneth R. Kleinman;  
 H. R. 2022. An act for the relief of Don B. Whelan;  
 H. R. 2433. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Raymond Gibson, a minor;  
 H. R. 3041. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to Frederick W. Lee the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a certain invention;  
 H. R. 3109. An act for the relief of Theodore W. Carlson;  
 H. R. 4532. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ann Elizabeth Caulk;  
 H. R. 4940. An act to provide for the redemption of District of Columbia tax stamps;

H. R. 4961. An act for the relief of Mrs. James J. O'Rourke;  
 H. R. 4996. An act for the relief of Col. Henry M. Denning, and others;  
 H. R. 5772. An act for the relief of Robert E. Leibbrand, and Rose Leibbrand; and  
 H. R. 7786. An act to honor veterans on the 11th day of November of each year, a day dedicated to world peace.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1331. An act for the relief of Mrs. Katherine L. Sewell;  
 H. R. 2512. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the purchase of public lands for home and other sites, approved June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609), as amended";  
 H. R. 3522. An act for the relief of Arthur S. Roschan;  
 H. R. 6452. An act for the relief of Mrs. Josette L. St. Marie; and  
 H. J. Res. 455. Joint resolution granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 46. An act for the relief of E. S. Berney;  
 S. 885. An act to provide for the disqualifications of certain former officers and employees of the District of Columbia in matters connected with former duties;  
 S. 914. An act for the relief of Mark Valner;  
 S. 974. An act for the relief of certain Chinese children;  
 S. 992. An act for the relief of Apostolos Savvas Vassiliadis;  
 S. 1165. An act for the relief of Paul E. Rocke;  
 S. 1382. An act for the relief of Elie Joseph Hamkin and family;  
 S. 1403. An act to authorize the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia to regulate and condition the declaration and payment of dividends by public utilities in the District of Columbia;  
 S. 1889. An act for the relief of Margot Goldschmidt;  
 S. 1900. An act for the relief of Gertrud Trindler O'Brien;  
 S. 1902. An act for the relief of Theresa Elizabeth Leventer;  
 S. 1904. An act for the relief of Ottillie Theresa Workmann;  
 S. 1959. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anne-Marie Namias;  
 S. 1967. An act for the relief of Paula Neumann Mahler (Paula Neumann Schibuk);  
 S. 1991. An act for the relief of Esperanza Jimenez Trejo;  
 S. 2009. An act for the relief of Mrs. Edward E. Jex;  
 S. 2172. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of veterinary medicine in the District of Columbia," approved February 1, 1907;  
 S. 2654. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell certain property owned by the District of Columbia located in Montgomery County, Md., and for other purposes;  
 S. 2657. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia";  
 S. 2661. An act to regulate the sale of shell eggs in the District of Columbia;

S. 2786. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to the southeastern interstate forest-fire protection compact;

S. 3103. An act to amend the act of January 12, 1951, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941;

S. 3137. An act to make the provisions of the act of August 28, 1937, relating to the conservation of water resources in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States, applicable to the entire United States, and to increase and revise the limitation on aid available under the provisions of said act, and for other purposes;

S. 3213. An act relating to the merger of the Columbus University of Washington, D. C., into the Catholic University of America, pursuant to an agreement of the trustees of said universities;

S. 3458. An act to authorize the long-term time charter of tankers by the Secretary of the Navy, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 156. Joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America of an instrument for the amendment of the constitution of the International Labor Organization; and

S. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation in the case of certain aliens.

#### GEORGE P. SYMRNIOTIS

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 683) for the relief of George P. Symrniotis, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 4, strike out "Symrniotis" and insert "Smyrniotis."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of George P. Smyrniotis."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MARTHA SCHNAUFFER

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3876) for the relief of Martha Schnauffer, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Martha Schnauffer may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Martha Schnauffer Shockley."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GRANTING OF THE STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the resolution (H. Con. Res. 197) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 25, after line 4, insert:

"A-6661397, Dimian, Bella Berca."

Page 25, after line 4, insert:

"A-7903809, Saganich, Giuseppe Bruno or Joseph Bruno Saganich or Saganey."

Page 25, after line 4, insert:

"0501-19738, Wang, Ting Pang or T. P. Wang."

Page 25, after line 4, insert:

"A-7609403, Yen, Ung Yu."

Page 25, after line 4, insert:

"A-7609402, Yen, Gwendoline Tsunglan nee Hwang."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### INDIANS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2974) to extend the time for enrollment of the Indians of California, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line, after "1955", insert "and by inserting after the third sentence 'For the purposes of clause (d) of this section, when the Secretary of the Interior is satisfied that reasonable and diligent efforts have been made to locate a person whose name is on said roll and that such person cannot be located, he may presume that such person died prior to the date of approval of this act, and his presumption shall be conclusive.'"

Page 2, line 3, after "602)", insert "as amended by the act of April 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 259)."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer for the RECORD at this time the following ex-

planation of the need for the two amendments:

First. The present statute directs the Secretary to remove from the 1933 roll the names of any persons who died between May 18, 1928, and May 24, 1950. It also directs the Secretary to make a \$150 per capita payment to each enrollee who was living on May 24, 1950.

The Secretary has been unable to determine whether 2,834 of the persons on the 1933 roll were or were not alive on May 24, 1950. The per capita payable to them if living on that date amounts to \$425,100.

If the statute is not changed as proposed in this amendment the names will be removed from the roll and the per capita fund will be held indefinitely in the Treasury pending the submission of a claim and proof of living status. It is probable that most of the amount will not be claimed, and the rest of the enrollees will, therefore, be deprived of judgment money that should be available for distribution to them. The issue is one of equity: Should the Congress tie up indefinitely a substantial sum of judgment money that belongs to the Indians of California by requiring the money to be held for persons whose living status cannot be determined by reasonable efforts?

Second. This amendment merely corrects the statutory citation.

The Senate amendments were concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. BAILEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.

#### UNITED STATES FACES CRISIS IN WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, people are supposed to learn by experience. A burned child doesn't touch a hot stove the second time. It is time for the United States to show that it has learned something from past experience.

Within a day or two we shall be honored with a visit from Haile Selassie, Emperor of Ethiopia. Remember him?



If the world had stood firm against Italy when she moved into Ethiopia, the chances are Hitler would not have dared to provoke World War II.

Today the United States faces another crisis—and this one is on our own doorstep. There is an invasion of the Western Hemisphere by the Communists. The Reds have established a beachhead in Guatemala. At first it was only a diplomatic beachhead, but the Reds now are ready to move out in all directions—by force if necessary.

That diplomatic beachhead has been in existence for several years. But the State Department, with its head-in-the-sand attitude, has chosen to ignore the danger of the situation. Now it is rapidly becoming another case of too little and too late. Halfhearted measures will not suffice to correct this invasion.

Stern measures must be taken now. The Monroe Doctrine is still in effect. It is time that it be invoked. A diplomatic slap on the wrist will not suffice. Conferences simply provide grist for the Communist propaganda mills. We must use our leadership in the Western Hemisphere to stop once and for all the threat of a Communist infiltration which is intended to take over Central and South America. We should take whatever steps are necessary—at once—before it is too late. In other days America has acted promptly and vigorously to protect her interests and her friends. The incident of the Barbary pirates, the campaigns of Andrew Jackson, the courage of Teddy Roosevelt all are part of a great heritage. In those days we did not hesitate to act; we did not allow ourselves to become entangled in diplomatic redtape; we got results.

#### COMMUNIST AGGRESSION IN CENTRAL AMERICA

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, it was announced this morning that the United States had started flying arms to Nicaragua and Honduras.

It is to be hoped that this is not another case of "too little and too late." It has been obvious for a long time that Guatemala has served as a beachhead for Soviet expansion in the Western Hemisphere.

Already the situation in some of the Central American countries is critical. I noted in the New York Times this morning that Mexico has begun to worry about the situation. One of the Mexican newspapers in commenting on the purchase of arms by Guatemala from behind the Iron Curtain had this to say:

But it is undoubtedly an act of open hostility to the United States and of complete ignorance of the spirit that animates the Organization of American States.

The news of the shipment of arms to Guatemala from Poland proves conclusively that Guatemala is the beachhead for Communist plots in the Western Hemisphere.

The fact that the ship was unloaded at night under the supervision of the Guatemalan Defense Minister is cause enough for real and genuine alarm on the part of our country.

The crippling strike in Honduras is directly attributable to Guatemalan intervention in Honduras. Reports now reach Washington that Guatemalan agents are now attempting to foment strikes in Panama. The canal itself may be threatened.

All of the evidence available here points to a genuine Soviet plot to seize power in the Western Hemisphere. The action in Guatemala constitutes a direct threat to the peace of this hemisphere. The United States, in my opinion, should immediately bring the situation to the attention of the Organization of American States to determine collective measures to be taken under the Caracas resolution and the Rio Treaty.

The United States must recognize that the threat of Communist aggression is real in Central America and our country must take positive action now.

#### SHIPMENT OF ARMS TO GUATEMALA

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on May 4 I made remarks in the House reiterating a warning about Soviet designs on our backyard in the Caribbean through Guatemala which I reminded the House, Speaker MARTIN and I had pointed out nearly 2 years ago. I have read in recent issues of the newspapers that the State Department has itself expressed alarm about the fact that a ship carrying Iron Curtain arms in quantities prodigious for Central America and obviously unnecessary for the needs of Guatemala, unless it has designs upon the integrity of its neighbor, has been allowed to land in Guatemala and the cargo, falsely labeled "hardware" on the manifest, taken without hindrance into the interior of the country. In other words the Kremlin, having taken over control of the political government of Guatemala, is now supplying them with Iron Curtain arms in large quantities. We notice from an account appearing in a recent issue of the New York Times shortly after the incident that the representative of Guatemala here brazenly admits that the State Department story is true.

This cargo of arms is like an atom bomb planted in the heart of our backyard. It is as if a Soviet ship brought an atom bomb in her hold and berthed

at a slip in New York Harbor calmly confident that at any time it could blow up the city of New York.

I ask that the Committee on Foreign Affairs immediately consider what we can do about this sort of an outrage. Have we so tied our hands with legalistic redtape that we have lost the power to act? When the British were threatened with Communist revolt and the interruption of their aluminum supply in British Guiana they acted. Are we beyond the capacity to act when the Kremlin thrusts a sword into our vitals like this? I ask the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Is there nothing we can do to prevent this sort of thing happening? What explanation has the State Department for a situation like this? Certainly, something must be done.

#### WORD OF GREETING AND APPRECIATION

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I am happy to be here. It is rather hard to find words to express the love and devotion which I have for the Members of this House and the people on Capitol Hill who have been so kind and thoughtful to me since the experience of March 1. The flowers you sent me brightened my hours in the hospitals. Your letters, calls, visits, and prayers did much to cheer me up and to strengthen and encourage me.

There are a number of individuals to whom I shall always be indebted. I hope if I leave someone out who has been kind to me you will overlook that on my part.

I am especially grateful to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, my good friend [Mr. PRIEST] whose quick action and alertness enabled him to fashion a tourniquet out of a necktie and stop the flow of blood until I could be rushed to the hospital for emergency treatment.

I am deeply thankful to our good Chaplain, Dr. Braskamp, who was constantly praying for me, and who came to see me many, many times.

I am also grateful to our Dr. Calver for his attention, especially for his selection of physicians. In the persons of Dr. O. H. Fulcher, a noted neurosurgeon, and Dr. J. Ross Veal, a famous vascular surgeon, I had the best of surgical care. For the aid and attention given me at Casualty Hospital and at Georgetown University Hospital, I am sincerely grateful to the doctors, members of the staff, nurses, and other personnel of these two splendid institutions.

To the people of Puerto Rico, I would like to say I have only the friendliest attitude. I know that the attack by the fanatical maniacs is not representative of these wonderful people. I know that we in the United States will not judge you in Puerto Rico by such people. I received hundreds of messages from schoolchildren on that lovely island; from civic leaders and leaders in government. I was honored by a visit from His Excellency, the Governor, Dr. Luis

Muñoz-Marín, and also from our esteemed Resident Commissioner, Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN.

I am deeply grateful to the people of my own beloved State and the people of my district because one of the nicest things that can happen to a man in public office is to be returned to office, and, fortunately, down my way, being the Democratic nominee means election, and I was renominated by a score of about 8½ to 1.

Above all, I am grateful to divine providence not only for having spared me, but for having spared leaders who were here on the House floor on that day. I do not think there is any question but that God was spreading His divine protection over the House of Representatives on that occasion. I think it may be that we could afford to rededicate our lives to the faith in our country, to faith in ourselves, and, above all, to faith in God because, I think, those faiths have made this country what it is today. And I shall always appreciate this demonstration on your part, and this ovation, although I know I am not worthy of it. I shall always cherish and remember it.

#### PROHIBITING SUBSIDIZING OF SUBVERSIVE PROPAGANDA BEING SENT THROUGH THE MAILS

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include additional material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which will deny second-class entry, permit for bulk mailings of third-class mail, or the book rate from publications, films, and printed matter sponsored by subversive organizations or which has as its objective the dissemination of communistic or other subversive propaganda.

In my judgment, this is the first step in clearing up postal policy which, at the present time, permits sending propaganda material directed against our form of government through our United States postal system. It has its foundation in studies made by a Postal Operations Subcommittee, of which I have the honor to be chairman.

Personally, I believe such material should be excluded from the mail entirely, but objections have been raised against such a sharp departure from past policy. This is based upon objections to censorship which would of necessity be a part of the administration of such a prohibition.

My bill is a first step, a long first step, toward excluding this material from the mail. It will deny below-cost postal rates to this type of propaganda material. It is unconscionable that American taxpayers should be called upon to pay a part of the cost of handling mail-

ings which are intended to undermine our form of government.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, this material can still go through the mail, but they will have to pay the freight on it. It may go first class or it may go fourth-class parcel post, but it will not be subsidized further by the American taxpayers.

Under my bill, the Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications, dated May 15, 1951, as revised—House Document No. 137, 82d Congress, 1st session—the list of organizations designated by the Attorney General in connection with the Federal employees security program, and those required to register as agents by the Subversive Activities Control Board shall be prima facie evidence that any publication of the organizations therein listed contains the matter making it unmailable at second-class rates, third-class bulk rates or the book rate.

My bill has been arrived at with the cooperation of the Post Office Department, the Department of State and the Department of Justice and, in a large measure, also as a result of studies by my subcommittee.

I hope that we can receive the reports of the executive departments and agencies promptly and trust that this legislation will be enacted at this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am attaching hereto a list of the publications which have second-class entry and which are contained in Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications, House Document No. 137, 82d Congress, 1st session:

LIST FURNISHED BY POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT SHOWING PUBLICATIONS LISTED IN GUIDE TO SUBVERSIVE ORGANIZATIONS AND PUBLICATIONS (H. Doc. No. 137, 82d Cong., 1st Sess.) WHICH HAVE SECOND-CLASS ENTRY

NAME OF PUBLICATION AND PUBLISHER
Action, see page 127.
Daily Worker, Publishers New Press, Inc., 35 East 12th Street, New York, N. Y.
Daily People's World, Pacific Publishing Foundation, Inc., 590 Folsom Street, San Francisco, Calif.
Honolulu Record, Honolulu Record Publishing Co., Ltd., 811 Sheridan Street, Honolulu.
Jewish Life, Progressive Jewish Life, Inc., 22 East 17th Street, New York, N. Y.
Labor Action, Labor Action Publishing Co., 114 West 14th Street, New York, N. Y. (This appears to be the organ of the Independent Socialist League, formerly the Workers' Party which organization is on the Attorney General's list.)
Lawyers Guild Review, National Lawyers Guild, 40 Exchange Place, New York, N. Y.
Ludove Noviny, John Zuskas, 1510 West 18th Street, Chicago, Ill.
L'Unita Del Popolo, Italian-American People's Publications, Inc., 130 East 16th Street, New York, N. Y.
Masses and Mainstream, Masses and Mainstream, Inc., 832 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (Appears to be successor to New Masses.)
Morning Freiheit, Morgen Freiheit, Inc., 35 East 12th Street, New York, N. Y.
Narodna Volya, Narodna Volya (People's Will) Co-op Publishing Co., Inc., 5856 Chene Street, Detroit, Mich.
Narodni Glasnik, Narodni Glasnik Publishing Co., 1413 West 18th Street, Chicago, Ill.
The New World (Novi Svet), Novi Svet Publication, 1845 West Cermak Road, Chicago, Ill.

New World Review, SRT Publications, Inc., 23 West 26th Street, New York, N. Y. (Successor to Soviet Russia Today.)

Our World, Our World Publishing Co., Inc., 35 West 43d Street, New York, N. Y.

Political Affairs, New Century Publishers, Inc., 832 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

Ukrainian Daily News, Ukrainian Daily News, Inc., 85 East Fourth Street, New York, N. Y.

UUS ILM, Uus Ilm Publishing Co., Inc., 126 East 120th Street, New York, N. Y.

Vistnik-Messenger, Rev. Stephen Varzaly, 146 Third Street, Rankin, Pa.

Vilnis, Workers Publishing Association, Inc., 3116 South Halsted Street, Chicago, Ill.

Yiddishe Kultur, Yiddisher Kultur Farband, Inc., 189 Second Avenue, New York, N. Y.

The German American, The German American, Inc., 130 East 16th Street, New York, N. Y.

NOTE.—There are several other publications with names similar to those which appear in House Document No. 137 although it is impossible to establish that the name registered in the Department as having second-class entry is the same as that listed in House Document No. 137. They include:

The California Eagle, Los Angeles, Calif.  
The People's Voice, Helena, Mont.  
The Spotlight, Glen Cove, N. Y.  
The Reporter, Ann Arbor, Mich.  
The Labor Herald, Wilmington, Del.  
Labor Herald, Baltimore, Md.

#### WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE? AND THE COMMUNIST CONTROL BILL

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, soon the Congress will take up the Communist control bill. Its obvious aim is to break up any bear hug the Kremlin would use to squeeze the life out of America.

There are some who hold that the failure of man to deal adequately with militarism, industrialism, and economic nationalism has encouraged communism to grow from a theory to a conspiracy; and that, as we govern the military, and manage industry and integrate national economies with four moral principles that motivate man for good on this earth, the principles of honesty, purity, unselfishness, and love, then, and only then, will the Communist threat recede and blow away. Others hold differently.

Where do we go from here?

Duell, Sloan & Pearce have put out a booklet entitled "Where Do We Go From Here?" It covers ground which I think will be helpful to the House in its consideration of the Communist control bill, soon to come before it.

Under unanimous consent heretofore granted, I include the booklet in the RECORD:

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?—A SIMPLE GUIDE TO THE WORLD WE LIVE IN, WHAT MAKES IT TICK, WHAT TO DO ABOUT IT

DEAR CITIZEN AND FELLOW SUFFERER: You may have felt, as we do, that life is uncomfortably like living on a volcano. You never know when the darn thing may go up.



So we decided to see what goes on in this world, what has gone to land us in the present mess, and what we can do about it.

Yours,

HANNEN AND CAMERON.

Many thousands of years ago there was an Ice Age.

And then there was a Stone Age, and in 5,000 B. C. the world entered the Bronze Age, and the Iron Age, and only 180 years ago a man harnessed a power as old as time and ushered in the Industrial Age, and now we are moving into the Ideological Age.

Yes; the ideological age—99 percent of the 2,400,000,000 people alive at the mid-point of this century don't realize this. Which causes much of the trouble, for it gives extraordinary power to the 1 percent who do. You'll only understand what's going on in the world when you understand an ideology. We wonder if you know what is an ideology?

We found out that an ideology is a faith which grips men and nations. It gives a philosophy, a passion, and a plan to change the world; and it creates the force of people to do it.

Ideas are today the deciding factor. The future depends on the idea that grips the minds of the millions. For instance, let's have a look at a couple of specimen ideologies that everyone knows.

You may or may not like these ideas, but you must admit they win people. Specimen No. 1, nazism: One man, Hitler, had an idea. His idea was: One race shall rule. He wrote a book—*Mein Kampf*. The idea struck a chord in millions of hearts and minds. In a few years a broken-down country became strong enough to challenge the world.

We all know what happened.

Specimen No. 2, communism: One man, Marx, had an idea. His idea was one class shall rule. He wrote a book *Das Kapital*. The idea appeals to millions who feel the world must be changed and that revolution is the only realistic way of doing it. In varying degrees every country is affected, and now half the world is controlled by those ideas.

No one who lives on this planet can remain unaffected by the ideological struggle, not even in the most remote places.

In every place—each country, each factory, each trade union, each university, each newspaper—materialist ideas reach out to grip men's minds.

Why do top scientists flee to other countries? Why do trusted men pass vital secrets to a foreign power? Why do even government officials from top social and educational backgrounds trot off? Because an ideology has captured their minds.

How an ideology takes over men and nations.

Vishinsky said: "We shall conquer the world, not with atomic bombs, but with our ideas, brains, and doctrines."

In the ideological age the future lies in the hands of those who know how to use ideas to win men's allegiance.

But the Communists haven't even got a seat in Parliament.

"I may have lost my seat in the House of Commons, but the Communists have taken 450 million people in China." (British Communist parliamentary candidate).

"The great issues will be settled, not in the arena of this reactionary Parliament, but by the workers' mass struggle in the factories and in the streets." (Secretary, British Communist Party).

We seem to be spending millions on armaments—I suppose it's the only way to be safe. Today we need not only a gun in our hand, we need an idea in our head and an answer in our heart. After all, nations have been taken over in recent years without a shot being fired. Modern warfare means that

nations are out-thought before they are out-fought.

You can't defeat an idea by being anti-it, ignoring it, or shooting it. You can only meet an idea with a superior idea.

What is the superior idea? (Slight pause for breath and refreshment while you get a piece of paper and write down what you feel is the superior idea.)

The Nazi idea was: A new order through the rule of one race.

The Communist idea is: A new society through the rule of one class.

The Superior idea is: A new world through the rule of one idea—"It's not who's right, it's what's right."

What's right? How do I know what is right?

There are absolute standards for human society just as there are for engineering.

What sort of a building would result if architect and builder did not employ recognized standards?

It's because we don't apply absolute standards to our living that society is in danger of collapse.

Here are the standards:

Absolute honesty: Honest apology is the highroad to lasting peace.

Absolute purity: A great cleansing force through the nations.

Absolute unselfishness: There is enough in the world for everyone's need, but not for everyone's greed.

Absolute love: If everyone cared enough and everyone shared enough, everyone would have enough.

These standards are the four pillars of a new age.

Yes; but why absolute? Because the world needs an authority everyone can accept. Besides, a standard must be absolute, or it isn't a standard.

Who wants a parachute that almost opens?

Who wants a boat that floats most of the time?

Who wants an egg that is nearly fresh?

But doesn't this sound rather like changing one's ways?

Yes; it does mean change. But change is the key to the world of today. It's a changing world, and to get along in it you've got to ----- (Write here 6-letter word meaning to adapt yourself to altering world circumstances.)

Everybody wants to see the other person change.

Every nation wants to see the other nation change.

But everyone is waiting for the other to begin.

If you want an answer for the world, the best place to start is with yourself (and your own nation).

How can I change?

"Men must choose to be governed by God, or they will condemn themselves to be ruled by tyrants" (William Penn).

By a miracle of science men can speak by radio to millions. By a miracle of the spirit, God can speak to every man. His voice can be heard in every home, every business, every government. When man listens, God speaks. When man obeys, God acts.

It does not matter who you are or where you are. Accurate, adequate information can come from the mind of God to the minds of men who are willing to take their orders from Him.

"This is the revolution which will end revolution by changing human nature and remaking men and nations" (Frank Buchman).

God gave us 2 ears and 1 mouth: Why don't we listen to Him twice as much as we talk?

It's worth thinking over: Am I part of the cure or part of the disease in the world?

Remember, you can't make a good omelette out of bad eggs.

How do I begin? Take pencil and paper. Write down your thoughts. They may seem ordinary, but be honest—absolutely. You may have things to put right—well, how else can you build a new world?

Honesty: What about money? Taxes? What I told the family? Everything?

Purity: Do I live on the get or on the give?

Unselfishness: Do I put the other fellow first? All the time?

Love: Anyone I hate? Dislike? Or just don't care for? Why?

(Is the world the way it is because I am like this?)

You don't think it's necessary to change? You think you can take all that's coming? So did the dinosaur.

"This tough guy ruled in ancient days, But one thing he forgot:

He failed to alter with the times— Today he just is not."

The fact is that— Human nature can be changed—that is the root of the answer.

National economies can be changed—that is the fruit of the answer.

World history can be changed—that is the destiny of our age.

New men, new nations, a new world. In the age when we've learnt to split the atom we must learn to unite humanity. It's get on together or blow up together.

In any negotiation it's not who's right—it's what's right.

Then industry will make the wealth and work of the world available for all and for the exploitation of none, and the workers will unite the world. This inspired ideology is for everyone everywhere.

It is the ordinary man's opportunity to remake the world.

With this ideology, industry will produce enough for the needs of all; homes will secure the next generation from chaos; armies will give new standards of moral training to their nations; cabinets and diplomats will be totally effective for they will have the power to turn enemies into friends; nations will arise from apathy, disillusion, and division. Renaissance is inevitable. This is our future—and it works.

That's what we found out. And the great thing is that these ideas have been tried out and proved practical in over 100 countries.

Results have been breathtaking. You'll find the same as you put this into action in your home and where you work.

Drop us a line if you want to know more.

Yours,

HANNEN AND CAMERON.

P. S.—Your bookstore has *The World Rebuilt*, by Peter Howard, which gives many facts, and we recommend it.

You can reach us care of Moral Rearmament.

## LEGISLATIVE BRANCH AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 555 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9203) making appropriations for the legislative branch and the judiciary branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for

other purposes, and all points of order against said bill or any provisions contained in said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

At this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON].

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful for this time. I am today introducing a resolution which I would like to read to the House:

Whereas this year marks the 100th anniversary of Florence Nightingale's historic nursing of the wounded in the Crimean War; and

Whereas Nurse Genevieve de Galard-Terraube, officer of the Army of the Republic of France, in her ministering to the sick and wounded at Dien Bien Phu and her subsequent service to her comrades as prisoners of the Viet Minh has provided an example of the courage of a woman in battle and of the devotion of a nurse to her sworn duty which has been unsurpassed in this century; and

Whereas this inspiring woman is representative of the devotion to duty of soldiers of the Republic of France, which has been an ally of the United States for 178 years and whose people today are considered the warm friends of the people of the United States; and

Whereas Nurse Genevieve de Galard-Terraube's example of fortitude in the face of supreme danger has changed the fall of Dien Bien Phu from a military reversal to a great psychological victory of the undefeated principles of free mankind fighting the force of darkness; and

Whereas this nurse, known affectionately as "The Angel of Dien Bien Phu," embodies the finest attributes of free women accepting with men the full burden of living in our modern world: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby extends to Nurse Genevieve de Galard-Terraube its warm congratulations for her gallant service and invites her, at the earliest time convenient to her and her country, to visit the United States as an honored guest.

The President is respectfully requested to transmit copies of this resolution to the Government of France, and to Nurse Genevieve de Galard-Terraube.

I deeply appreciate this opportunity of presenting this myself to the Members of the House, a concurrent resolution, which I am now introducing.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption of House Resolution 555, making in order the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9203) making appropriations for the legislative branch and the judiciary branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

House Resolution 555, Mr. Speaker, provides for an open rule, waiving points of order against the bill, and allows for 2 hours of general debate on the bill itself.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, specifically appropriates the money to take care of the expenses for the fiscal year of 1955 of the House of Representatives, the Architect of the Capitol, and the Botanic Gardens, the Library of Congress, the Government Printing Office, and the Judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, I think it should be noted here that the budget estimate for 1955 came out with the figure \$87,063,993, or \$4,758,048 more than the Appropriations Committee has asked the Congress to appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most pertinent points that I found in the report of the Appropriations Committee on this bill was the fact that the legislative-judiciary appropriation bill is the smallest of the regular annual appropriation bills, and that it represents less than two-tenths of 1 percent of the appropriations for the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, the Appropriations Committee has presented what I think is an excellent bill to the Congress. I would like to congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the members of the committee on the very fine work that they have done on this bill. I hope that the rule will be adopted so that we may proceed expeditiously to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on the rule. I know of no objection to the rule or to the bill. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9203) making appropriations for the legislative branch and the judiciary branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9203, with Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] is recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] will be recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, the total in this bill is about \$2,250,000 below last year's appropriation for this purpose, and about \$4,750,000 below the Budget estimate. There are two areas of increase. In the House of Representatives we have increased the allowances because it was brought to the committee's attention that too many of the Members were paying for their office expenses out of their own pockets. We have also increased clerk hire and raised the base.

In the judiciary we have provided for the further air conditioning of the Supreme Court Building to the extent of \$150,000; and for the new judges that were created by legislation recently together with supporting personnel needed by them.

The fees of jurors and commissioners due to increased Federal court work have been increased \$160,000.

I want to say that we followed the practice of the other body by providing a more honest and more proper gratuity payment for deceased help up here on the Hill. The other body has had this same plan for 2 years and we are simply following the Senate's lead in that regard.

This bill, of course, carries appropriations in the legislative branch for the House of Representatives. We have nothing to do with appropriations for the other body. It also carries appropriations for the Botanic Gardens, the Government Printing Office, and the Library of Congress.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I have asked the gentleman from Washington to yield with reference to the Library of Congress. I note that on page 18 of the bill you refer to the Legislative Reference Service and the Digest of Public and General Bills. I had a rather peculiar experience this morning that I think should be called to the attention of the House and this appropriations subcommittee.

I had some correspondence and some calls relative to House resolutions and bills pending before this body and before the Rules Committee of which I am a member. To my amazement when I turned to the Legislative Digest I was unable to find any reference whatsoever to those bills which actually are legislative matters. I then called the Library of Congress with reference to it and could not get any information whatever. So I called the well-known Elmer Lewis in the document room just off the House



floor and had him read this House resolution to me so that I might get the information I wanted. According to my understanding, the Library of Congress was originally established to serve the Congress of the United States and I think for the benefit of the Congress we should insist or the gentleman's committee should insist that the Legislative Digest as given to Members of Congress and as made available to certain Government officials for their use contain all legislative matters that may be pending. We ought to be able to turn to that document and find out information in reference to any legislative proposal so that we may know what it is and not have to spend an hour or two running around trying to locate information on the matter.

Mr. HORAN. I do not think there is any question but what the gentleman from Ohio is exactly right. I call attention to page 4 of our report where we try to spell out there for the benefit of the House of Representatives what we think the Legislative Reference Service should be for the benefit of Members of Congress. If they will stay within the work they were set up to do I think we will have less trouble in that regard and they will be more service to us.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I have no desire to offer an amendment to this bill because the committee and the subcommittee have done an excellent job; but I am hoping that the committee will take this matter up with the Library of Congress. With that understanding I will not offer an amendment. I hope in the future we may have House and Senate resolutions contained in the Legislative Digest for the benefit of the working Members of Congress. Some of us do work on these legislative matters.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I have no disposition to offer an amendment or to quarrel in any way with the wording of the committee in its report, page 4, where they are somewhat critical of the work of the Legislative Reference Service. I have not read the hearings and I am not familiar with all of the factors which entered into the decision of the committee in making those critical references; however, I do think I would be unfair to those who have cooperated with me if I did not as one Member of the House say that the Legislative Reference Service has been extremely helpful to me in many matters which I have referred to them. I regret that the committee feels that they have in some respects gone outside of their proper province. I may say, and I think I should say, that I am apparently in part in error because I have requested them on occasions to draft bills for me. I was not aware that that was not a proper function of the Legislative Reference Service. Perhaps I should have been. But in all respects they have always been very cooperative with me and I feel in fairness that I should make that a matter of record at this point.

Mr. HORAN. In reply to the gentleman from New York, may I say that if we appear to be critical in this report it is intended only for clarification of the specific purpose for which the Legislative Reference Service was set up originally in 1946. We feel it is the duty of the Appropriations Committee to know the intent of the Congress and to occasionally bring the administration back to home base, so to speak. They did draft last year 16 bills. We did not think that that was their job, since we have a Legislative Counsel to do that work, and in this work we have increased his fund \$13,000 so that he can be equipped to take care of the Members. Now we are still looking into some of the contractual relationships that the Legislative Reference Service has had with certain neo or full administration departments. We think they should clear the deck entirely for service to the Members, and if we find them straying, I think it is our job to call that to their attention. They have done splendid work for the chairman of this subcommittee, and I want to state here and now that if we appear to be critical, we hope it is in a constructive direction.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I am sure the gentleman noted in last night's Washington Star a lead editorial critical of the committee with reference to funds for the Library of Congress, the gist of the criticism being, as I understood it, that the tremendous and great facilities of the Library would not be made fully available to the country generally in the future. That was my understanding of the criticism. Is that a just criticism, or is that correct?

Mr. HORAN. I do not feel that it is. We have allowed them in excess of \$8 million of direct appropriations and they have more than \$2.5 million of transfer funds from other departments. We have watched it very closely. Such reductions as we have made here were made on the basis of the experience of their handling of funds and the amount they are apt to obligate at the end of the fiscal year, and that is where the cut was made. We do feel that originally it was set up as the Congressional Library. Now we have deviated from that. We have in operation over there trust funds as well as direct appropriations and transfers. So, naturally, to that extent, it is a national monument. We do not object to that, but we do want clarification in its relationships with the Members of this body.

Mr. ALBERT. I think that is the important point. Of course, primarily it was organized to serve the Congress, and I think that should always remain its primary function. It is a great institution in which the taxpayers have invested hundreds of millions of dollars and in which are collected some of the finest library works in the world. I do not think the committee intended that this should be a curtailment of the use of the Library in any way by other depart-

ments of the Government or by scholars or other Americans interested in it.

Mr. HORAN. That is true.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the gentleman tell me whether, as the result of these cuts, the Library card service of the Library of Congress will be curtailed?

Mr. HORAN. We do not feel that it will be. That is a very fine service. I know some people are trying to legislate through the Western Union in this regard.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have not received any telegrams.

Mr. HORAN. Well, I have.

Mr. McCARTHY. What curtailment will result?

Mr. HORAN. We do not feel that that service will be curtailed in the least.

Mr. McCARTHY. What service will be curtailed?

Mr. HORAN. None.

Mr. McCARTHY. And there will be no reduction in service?

Mr. HORAN. There will be, I suppose, a new Librarian of Congress. One has been designated, and we had him come here and sit in as an observer, because we believe that business methods could be employed in the Library that would effect a saving. I would like to say that we put the Government Printing Office on a business type budget last year, and this year Mr. Blattenberger was able to return \$5 million to the Treasury. That sort of thing can be employed, we think, in the Library, where some of their fiscal practices have been quite loose.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I want to commend the gentleman for the statement he has made about the effort to improve the practices in the Library and also to commend him for the statement that the committee feels there is no effort being made to curtail what you might call the national functions to the public and service to the public by the Library of Congress. I think it is a great American institution that we should preserve as a part of this great country of ours.

Mr. HORAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. Yes, I yield.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I see that the committee has reduced all of the services of the Library, according to the amounts of money that have been approved. First of all I wanted to ask about the Copyright Office. That pays its own way and turns in a balance to the Federal Treasury, does it not?

Mr. HORAN. It does not pay its way entirely. The only self-supporting institution in this entire bill, as I understand it, is that of the Superintendent of Documents.

Mr. LECOMPTE. What about the card catalog?

Mr. HORAN. No; that is about \$100,000 short of being self-supporting.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Is the gentleman's committee aiming to curtail those services?

Mr. HORAN. No.

Mr. LECOMPTE. What I wanted to ask about principally is the Legislative Reference Service. That is the reason we have the Library. That is the whole purpose of it. That is to say, it is for the purpose of advising Members of Congress and doing research for Members. The Legislative Reference Service it seems to me is the reason for having the Library. The Legislative Reference Service has to take over the drafting of bills when the drafting service is overloaded. All Members of Congress employ the Legislative Reference Service.

Mr. HORAN. Will the gentleman permit me to reply to that? I think if the gentleman's great committee would get together and authorize them to draft bills, then it would be legal for them to do so. But in their basic legislation, there is no requirement that they draft bills.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I understand that, but when bills have to be drafted and the regular drafting service is overloaded, the gentleman has no objection to the Legislative Reference Service taking over, does he?

Mr. HORAN. Yes, I do.

Mr. LECOMPTE. What about my committee? We draft bills and resolutions on request for Members.

Mr. HORAN. We have set up the Legislative Counsel to draft bills and until the gentleman's committee changes that, that is going to be the service that drafts bills.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Does the gentleman object to the House Administration Committee drawing up resolutions? We do that for individual Members right along.

Mr. HORAN. The gentleman is asking me questions about this bill, which is all right. But I cannot answer that question. We have two services that are in conflict according to the gentleman's question. One is the Legislative Counsel whose job it is to draft bills. The job of the Legislative Reference Service is not to draft bills.

Mr. LECOMPTE. We can put a stop to that instantly with an order.

Mr. HORAN. We have stopped it in the bill.

Mr. LECOMPTE. If the gentleman objects to their taking care of the overflow, that is something else. All they take care of is the overflow.

Mr. HORAN. We feel that they should not be working for other departments, but only for Congress.

Mr. LECOMPTE. It is not a question of other departments. The extra work that the gentleman refers to in the case of other departments is when committees take one of the staff of the Legislative Reference Service and employ all of his time for a considerable period, for which the Service should be reimbursed, but frequently is not.

Mr. HORAN. I call the gentleman's attention to the schedules shown on

page 249 of the hearings where he can learn about these contractual relationships which we have criticized. This Service was begun in 1946 with a beginning appropriation of about \$178,000. They came back this year and wanted almost a million dollars. They had over \$900,000 last year.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Here is what the figures show. The Legislative Service had \$901,000. They asked for a little bit of extra help to take care of the 32-percent increase in their workload. The gentleman's committee not only did not give them any money for that increase, but cut the Service below what had been provided for the current year. The gentleman's committee cut the Legislative Reference Service \$143,000.

Mr. HORAN. No; that is, below the estimate, but not below what they had the previous year.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The gentleman did not approve for them the same amount that they had the previous year. They were cut despite the increase in the workload.

Mr. HORAN. That is correct. Part of that was due to the 16 pieces of legislation that they drafted for which they were not set up.

Mr. LECOMPTE. That did not take half of the time of one employee. They have about 140 employees, and the action of the committee will reduce them to 130. That is what the figures show. In my own mind I can scarcely consider the action of the committee as an exercise of economy, when the bill is filled with legislation on an appropriation bill that will cost millions of dollars, and comes before the House under a rule waiving all points of order.

I think the time is going to come when this House will have to face up to the proposition of what to do about legislation on appropriation bills. The jurisdiction of the several committees is going to have to be preserved if we are to proceed in an orderly manner. In my own mind I cannot reconcile the idea of one committee stepping over into the jurisdiction of another committee. Your whole bill is going to cost a great deal more money than the little dab you are trying to take off the Legislative Service, which serves individual Members and each of the committees of both Houses of Congress.

Mr. HORAN. We suffer sometimes when the proper committees do not function, and that is what is here.

Mr. LECOMPTE. If you are interested in the things that you put into this bill that are truly legislation on an appropriation bill, why, if you wanted to get the committees to function, did you not introduce resolutions and have them go to the appropriate committees?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. May I ask the chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations whether the impression which is prevalent today, and has been the last few days, is correct,

that the Library of Congress has not been functioning according to the present intention of the Congress; whether or not their activities are being less devoted to the needs of the Congress than they should be?

Mr. HORAN. We thought they were, after hearings, and we thought that enough so that we put in the report words spelling out what we thought the duties of the Legislative Reference Service to the Congress were.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Would the gentleman say the service rendered to the Members of Congress on their request was not quite satisfactory in the past 3 or 4 years, or something to that effect?

Mr. HORAN. We do not say that. We are trying to spell out what the duties are. They are not to draft bills, as we have legislative counsel to perform that function. That is a duplication of effort. It is in the interest of economy in the Congress and the Nation, I think, to cut out duplication where it occurs. That is the way we felt about it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman is absolutely right in that respect, but I just wondered whether there is any justification for complaints that we occasionally hear from Members of Congress who have made requests to the Library of Congress for certain information that proper research has not been made. Is there any justification for those complaints? Has the committee found any such justification in its hearings?

Mr. HORAN. No; we have received no such complaints.

Mr. EBERHARTER. So the curtailment that is recommended by your committee will not result in any lessening of the service of the staff of the Library of Congress to the Members of Congress?

Mr. HORAN. I do not feel that it will.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman does not think it will even result in any lessening of services to the general public?

Mr. HORAN. That is not our feeling.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Then why was it necessary within the past few years to curtail the number of hours the Library has been open to service the people of the country?

Mr. HORAN. I do not understand they have curtailed the hours.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It used to be open in the evening.

Mr. HORAN. It still is.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I understand it now closes at 6 o'clock. Is that correct?

Mr. HORAN. The Library is still open. I understand you cannot get books after 6.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is some curtailment of services to the public, then. Would the chairman express an opinion as to whether or not it is a good idea to close the Library in some respects at 6 o'clock, thereby preventing some workingpeople from using the facilities of the Library?

Mr. HORAN. We are not trying to run the Library of Congress. We are pointing out what we think are the relationships between the Congress and the Library. It is the Librarian's job to use his employees over there in such a way



as to give maximum service. He has 2,300 persons working in the Library, and over 700 of them operate on transferred funds. He has plenty of help. He has 80 guards, 4 more guards than the Capitol Police Force. They are not suffering so badly as you might think.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Would the gentleman agree with me then that it is the opinion of the subcommittee that the present recommended appropriation is sufficient to satisfy the needs and the proper purposes of the Library?

Mr. HORAN. We think so, surely.

Mr. EBERHARTER. And if the recommendation of the committee is followed, there will be no further curtailment of services either to the Members of Congress or to the public?

Mr. HORAN. We do not think there will be.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I do have a rather critical observation to make. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee will recall that the Congress during the first session of the present Congress set up the well known Randall Commission to study our trade policies. The Library assigned one of their chief research men to accompany the group to Europe to make those studies, and since their return and the report of the Randall Commission, 2 or 3 of their research experts have been engaged in making surveys in congressional districts over the Nation to try to justify the recommendations of the Randall report. I think they are going just a little bit far afield when they go into propaganda in support of policies of that nature. I do not know how much information the committee might have on what is going on there, but that is true and this research is being made right at the present time.

Mr. HORAN. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. Would you not say that if the recommendations of your committee, and the suggestions made in your committee report were followed through by the Library, that there will be better service and more efficient service for less money as a result of it?

Mr. HORAN. That is what we feel. That is the reason we did this.

Mr. MASON. That is your main object, is it not?

Mr. HORAN. Surely.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I find it somewhat difficult to reconcile the answer you have just given with the statement in the final sentence in the report dealing with the Library of Congress in which you say, "The reductions are due to the committee's feeling that the Library has gone far beyond the function for which it was originally created." Now which functions are you going to contract? You say all of the things the Library is doing

now will be continued, yet you say the reductions are due to the committee's feeling that the Library has gone beyond the functions for which it was originally created. Which functions are going to be eliminated, and which are going to be restricted?

Mr. HORAN. Well, we hope that they will quit publishing folklore tales telling you how to get warts off your fingers. We hope they will not publish such things as a girl out in Kansas telling you how to cure a bellyache by reaching down and picking up a clod and spitting where the clod was and then laying the clod back on it, and that that will cure your stomachache. We think that they probably can get away from the publication at least of that sort of thing.

Mr. McCARTHY. You do not think that should be in the Library of Congress?

Mr. HORAN. No; I do not think we should appropriate money for that sort of thing.

Mr. McCARTHY. Do you not think that perhaps the records should show that that is one of the things that people once believed in this country?

Mr. HORAN. I do not think so; no.

Mr. McCARTHY. Do you think the Library of Congress should show that some Republicans at one time said that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation would ruin the American banking system or is that just as ridiculous as the thing you just mentioned?

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, with reference to the work done by the Library of Congress, and I have received telegrams from the libraries showing the importance of this program, I, for one, believe the Library of Congress is rendering an excellent service not only for the Members of Congress but for the people of this country, and for the libraries. I know many instances where Dr. Ernest S. Griffith and his group have rendered splendid service through the Legislative Reference Section and other sections of the Library of Congress, and I know James Radigan, of the Law Digest Section, has performed a splendid service many times when, because of the heavy work load our Legislative Counsel down here was unable to draft bills for Members. I wish to pay this compliment to Ernest Griffith, Jim Radigan and all the employees of the Library of Congress.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I am in accord with the chairman of the committee. I made this statement not in a humorous way. I made it in the committee; that in the Congressional Library you can get anything but furnished rooms. But now the complaint is there are not enough baths over there. I mean that sincerely.

When we were elected in 1948, the first thing this reference part of the Library did was to come before the committee. I happened to be the ranking member then. We gave them 40 new employees.

Now they come in for 20 more this year in this bill. We did not give them to them. Then they call up Congressmen and say they have been discriminated against; that they asked for 20 employees and did not get them. What the chairman wanted to point out was the difference between the Legislative Reference Library and the Legislative Counsel. If a Congressman wants a bill drawn up, there is the place to have it done. If there is not enough help down there, we are satisfied to give them the help, but not to the Library, and have that reference crowd there draw it up. We want them to stay in their own field.

It is the same in other ways. They have taken over everything that the Smithsonian Institution should take over. It takes a lot of new help to look after it all. A Congressman goes over there and calls for a book and they tell him there are 8 or 10 people downtown who are ahead of them on requests for that book. "We are sorry, but you will have to wait a couple of weeks." From what I understand, the Library was set up for the benefit of Congress. That is what we are trying to do—to keep it over there, and at the same time keep it the best library in the world for all Americans, whether daytime or nighttime. Let people go over there and have the use of that Library, but let them stay in their own field. Let them stay out of the Smithsonian Department and the Archives Building downtown. We spent a lot of money setting that up, but the Library wants to take that over too. I think this is a good bill and I am in accord with the chairman.

I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY].

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to go along with the committee if this reduction is warranted, but after reading the report and listening to the discussion, I am not satisfied that a good case has been made by the committee. On the one hand we are assured that no function of the Library will be eliminated or reduced. Then in the report we read that—

The reductions are due to the feeling of the committee that the Library has gone far beyond the function for which it was originally created.

If this is the case, it seems to me that the point made by the gentleman from Iowa earlier should be taken up by the legislative committee which is responsible for the operation of the Library. We should not act on confused and contradictory recommendations from the Appropriations Committee with regard to the Library of Congress.

I have some criticism to make of the Legislative Reference Service. It is my opinion that oftentimes the Reference Service does not operate as a research service should operate. It is my opinion that the Library service should be objective. If a Member calls and says, "I want research on this question," the Legislative Service should not in my opinion ask, "Which side are you on?" as I have been told they sometimes do.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If what the gentleman says is true they should not ask—

Mr. McCARTHY. That is my opinion.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But if you pursue it further I think you will find they do not pay any attention to what particular views a Congressman wants information on; they put in their own.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think a legislative committee should take that up, and perhaps we should give congressional instruction and direction to the Reference Service.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What I mean is that they argue from their point of view instead of giving you information on both sides of it.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the gentleman is right. It is my opinion that the research people employed are in some cases incompetent. I think we ought to have more and better people in the service who can effectively do research beyond looking up an article in an encyclopedia and sending it over to a Member of Congress as a piece of research.

Despite these criticisms, I do not think that this reduction is justified. If we are to make a cut, we should have better reasons than a statement by a member of the Appropriations Committee that some of the folklore which has been recorded in the Library of Congress does not in his opinion have much importance or any worth. We should let the proper legislative committee take up the problem.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, in discussing this question of the Library of Congress, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] brought in the matter of the Randall Commission report. We, of course, are getting quite familiar with commissions these days, and getting quite familiar with reports of commissions; but action by Congress as a result of these reports and these recommendations of the various commissions is totally lacking, it seems to me.

When the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] brought up that subject, he was not, of course, in agreement with the report of the Randall Commission with respect to the extension of the reciprocal trade agreements program for another 3 years, which is very much in line with the dynamic program of President Eisenhower. That was one of the main planks in his forceful exposition to the American people of what is absolutely necessary for this country in order to make progress and not go back to the old, old discarded and discredited system of high tariffs.

We all know, Mr. Chairman, that the personnel of the Randall Commission was about as high grade and as high quality as it was possible to obtain in the entire United States. They really

worked hard. They went over to Europe and spent quite a few days there in consultations, studies, and research, and other things. They came back with a very fine report.

The reciprocal trade agreements program expires within about 3 weeks' time, and no action has been taken yet, no hearings have been held, no further studies have been made by the proper committees of Congress with respect to the recommendations made by this very expensive Randall Commission. This could create doubt in the minds of many as to whether or not we ought to continue this practice of creating commissions to make further studies on various subjects. We authorized a number of commissions within the last 10 days to deal with education. Most all of them are useless, in my opinion, of course; nevertheless, the House adopted the resolutions creating them.

I do not know but what the Library of Congress perhaps could take over these studies and research problems, and, as was suggested by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], they could make objective studies and reports to the Congress. Maybe we could do away with the necessity for bringing in people from business and the professions, from the colleges, and so forth, and have some objective reports from the Library of Congress.

It is quite a few weeks since the Randall Commission made its report and recommendations, as I stated before, but so far, nothing has been done about them. Ever since those recommendations and reports were made they have been dying a slow death. Just 2 or 3 days ago the President of the United States admitted the demise of the Randall report by saying he would be willing to accept just a 1-year extension of the reciprocal trade agreements program, which is having the effect of sounding the death knell to all recommendations of that Commission. This should cause us to think whether or not it would be better for the President to wait until next year before he attempts to force action by Congress to carry out his recommendations with respect to the reciprocal trade program; because next year he will have Members of the Democratic Party in the majority who are sympathetic with that program, who are sympathetic with the idea of a more trade, less aid program; then he will not be at such odds with Members of his own party.

I am making the suggestion, Mr. Chairman, that instead of appointing all of these various commissions to report on every subject that comes before the Congress, we ought to enlarge the facilities of the Library of Congress. I am making this suggestion rather seriously, too.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON].

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I am always very reluctant to differ with a committee, even in reference to small, perhaps immaterial, things that they bring to us on the floor of the House. I can understand quite well that sometimes matters get to such a stage that the only way to insure change is to really cut until it hurts. We Republicans had to do that in the 80th Congress. We have had to do that many times since. No one in this House, I think, is more eager to see really economical methods used in every department of the Government than we women, who are particularly keen on the details of meticulous economy. We have to do that in our homes and we are very happy to play a part in the house-keeping of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, I am deeply interested in the arguments that have been made because I am very reluctant to see the committee make cuts in the wrong places thereby really depriving the membership of both Houses of Congress of the kind of material for which this Library was organized. Of course, it was initiated primarily for the use of the Congress; but it has become also a source of helpfulness, very important helpfulness, to all libraries in the country.

It will be remembered that President Theodore Roosevelt, in his message to Congress in 1901, declared that "this Library has a unique opportunity to render to the libraries of this country—to American scholarship—services of the highest importance." This great President said—half a century ago—that planned expansion in its services will "enable it to become, not merely a center of research, but the chief factor in great co-operative efforts for the diffusion of knowledge and the advancement of learning."

Mr. Chairman, I am particularly troubled over the fact that these cuts in appropriations will cut down such things as the cataloging in the Library of Congress. I would like to call the attention of the membership, especially the membership of this committee, that the cataloging activities in the Library of Congress are exceedingly important. If books cannot be cataloged, they cannot be put on the shelves. There are many things coming into that Library that have a continuing effect upon our knowledge of the countries with whom we are contending throughout the world. I might take, as an example, China. We have the greatest collection in the world of up-to-date information on China. I should be very regretful if on the first day of July we could no longer add to the China collection. The Library of Congress is important to our Army, our Navy, and our Air Force. I hope my colleagues will consider such matters.

I am also very much concerned because the Librarian, whose appointment is now awaiting the approval of the Senate, comes from my district. He is the head of the Cleveland library and has done perfectly magnificent work there in economy and in effective library administration. I should be reluctant to



have him come in to such a reduced force that he could not function. I would ask that most careful consideration be given to all these points by the membership.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I am not a regular member of this subcommittee but have been serving during this session for one of the members who was unable to be present. I probably do not use the Library as much as I should. But, I certainly have found no reason for criticism of the service that they have rendered my office. I have found them always prompt, efficient, and able to furnish the information that I seek.

Mr. Chairman, unquestionably the Library of Congress has departed from its original concept. The Congress established the Library originally so that they might have available a few reference books from which they could obtain information necessary to help them in their deliberations. But, after the Library of Congress was set up, the people of the United States and the Congress of the United States realized that it could exert a great influence on the scholarship of this country and render a far greater service if its activities were extended. Consequently, throughout the years, by various statutes, we have increased these activities.

The question we face today, Mr. Chairman, is how far are we going to extend those activities? The Library is engaged primarily in rendering service. We are going to get just the service that we pay for.

Let us take the Legislative Reference Service. Evidently that Service is rendering a very satisfactory service to the Members of Congress, because requests for information have increased 32 percent. They asked for an additional appropriation to take care of the 32 percent increase. In view of the tremendous expenditures we have to make today and in view of our fiscal situation, we have to make appropriations in the light of the conditions that we face. But, let us not deceive ourselves into thinking that we are improving the service of the Library of Congress by cutting this appropriation. There will probably be times when we will be delayed in this House in getting information that we want if we approve this appropriation, but it is possible that it is not necessary for us to have the information as quickly as the Library of Congress might want to give it to us. As I see it, we are faced here with a practical problem. We have got to measure the needs of the Library of Congress with the ability of the Government at this time to appropriate.

Frankly, I am sorry that it has been necessary to cut some of these appropriations. I think it is unfortunate. I do not believe we are going to get as good service. The Library of Congress, and certainly the Legislative Reference Service may have gone afield at times in drafting bills. I believe that bills for the Congress should be drafted by the legislative drafting service. But I doubt that

the elimination of that activity is going to save any great amount of time or money.

But I do say this, Mr. Chairman: Through the years we have passed various laws extending the services of the Library and we now have a hodge-podge of legislation pertaining to it. Our report recommends, and I think properly so, that one of the first duties of the new Librarian should be to codify the laws relating to the Library of Congress so that the legislative committee may review those laws, clearly define the activities of the Library, in a new, codified law, so that by reference to one statute we can determine exactly what are the proper activities of the Library of Congress. I think that is a step in the right direction and I hope it will be done.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWELL].

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me so that I may ask the gentleman from Ohio a question. The statement was made a few moments ago that Members of Congress sometimes have to be put on waiting lists for books and other services from the Library of Congress because they are being used by the downtown agencies. The Chief of the Loan Division has told me that their policy is always to give Members of Congress first call. If that is not their policy, it ought to be their policy, and should be established as such in this debate. Their primary function is to serve the Congress and Members of Congress.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit me, I can say that that is so out of my own experience. I was told by the Library of Congress that I was eighth or ninth on a list for a certain book. The book was downtown being used by people ahead of me on that list. The general counsel over there went out and bought the book out of his own pocket and delivered it to me.

Mr. ALBERT. I think the legislative committee ought to straighten them out on that matter.

Mr. KIRWAN. That is what we are trying to do in this bill.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, the Library of Congress is the greatest institution of its kind in the world. I think most Members of Congress are deeply proud that this institution, which is part of Congress, is so unique and outstanding. We should be proud of it.

Yet in this appropriation bill, we are being asked to punish the Library of Congress—punish it for doing such a remarkable job. Because it has done so well in assembling and making available to Congress, to the Government, to libraries throughout the Nation and abroad, and to the general public the greatest collection of fact and information in the world, we are asked to slash its appropriation by 13 percent below the budget requests.

What other conclusion can we reach from the actions of the Committee on Appropriations and from the report it

filed with us criticizing and condemning the Library not for failing to give outstanding service under severe handicaps but rather for giving too much service?

The committee has scaled down the Library's requests from \$10,209,883 to \$8,915,000. This is a cut of \$1,294,883—more than a million and a quarter. It is more than half a million dollars below the \$9,459,293 appropriated for the current year. The hearings are filled with illustrations of the Library's difficulties in operation under the present appropriation. The hearings show how the Library's expenses will increase in the coming year even if there is no added personnel—the expenses of mailing which it now must bear; the in-grade pay increases required by law, and so on.

I have tremendous sympathy for the members of the Appropriations Committee in trying to cut expenditures of the Federal Government and still provide adequate sums for essential services. It is one of the most hardworking and most conscientious committees of the whole Congress. It faces a monumental task.

But it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that when it got around to the Library of Congress, the committee's accumulated frustrations in trying to find places to cut extravagance and waste out of the Federal operations seemed to have exploded into a general field day of criticizing the Library for working so hard at its tasks.

We find constant references in the hearings to wart cures and limericks. One might get the impression that these references involved Library activities. What happened, apparently, was that one of the Library's specialists in American folklore appeared on a radio program and mentioned some of the oddities of legend and fact and information in the Library's extensive collections.

So now the Library is punished by a budget cut of more than a million and a quarter dollars, on the grounds that it is wasting time and money with non-essentials.

Mr. Chairman, who among us is wise enough to set himself up as a judge of the usefulness of all of the vast information in the Library's possession? Do we fear scholarship and research? Are we afraid of what is in books?

Of course not. But as Members of Congress we are acutely aware of the need for careful expenditure of Federal funds. We do not want to appropriate money for pamphlets on wart cures.

At the same time, however, I do not think we want to slash the effectiveness of the greatest library in the world. And that is what this reduced appropriation would do.

Throughout the hearings, the Library officials reported on the difficulties of finding enough time and personnel to catalogue and make useful the tremendous amount of new material coming into the library all the time. What good is amassing the information if it cannot be found and used?

But instead of permitting a modest increase in the Library's funds to help

its hardworking personnel to catch up with the flood of work, we are now asked to cut it further. We are asked to cut the Library's general funds by half a million dollars on the grounds that it does a lot of work for the general public rather than just for Congress. Mr. Chairman, there is no better way for a library to serve Congress than to help get facts to the public—not propaganda, but the facts. An informed public is the best help there is to a conscientious Congress. And this Library is the greatest source of fact and objective information in the world. Instead of regretting that the public uses it extensively, we should rejoice in that.

We are asked to cut the Copyright Office by \$153,000. Yet all the evidence shows that nearly every cent appropriated for the operation of the Copyright Office comes back to the Treasury with a profit besides.

The same with the operation of the card catalogue distribution system. We are cutting that \$358,000, yet here again appropriations do not necessarily mean expenditures by the Federal Government. The libraries throughout the country pay back nearly every cent we appropriate for this essential service.

When we come to the item of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library, showing a cut of \$143,837 rather than the increase in funds the Service needs to continue giving Congress unmatched service, the reduction is even more incomprehensible. I cannot understand how we would want to cut off our own noses as this bill proposes—reduce the service available to the Congress in getting at the facts of the complex legislation we have to consider.

At the appropriate time when the bill is open to amendment, Mr. Chairman, I intend to submit an amendment to restore the full budget amount to the Legislative Reference Service. I shall discuss the reasons in detail at that time.

My purpose in rising now is twofold: to notify the committee of my intention to amend the appropriation for the Legislative Reference Service, and also to obtain from the committee members, if possible, a much better explanation than that given us in the report for the heavy-handed slashing of the whole Library appropriation.

This Library is a credit to Congress in every possible way. We are being asked to punish it for being so outstanding. To me, that is incredible.

Mr. Chairman, as part of my remarks, as exhibits A and B, I submit two informed comments on this matter, one an article from yesterday morning's Washington Post and Times Herald by Columnist Malvina Lindsay entitled "Warts Spur Solons to Corner Culture," and the other an editorial from last night's Washington Evening Star entitled "Nation's Library or the Congress?"

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Post and Times-Herald of May 24, 1954]

WARTS SPUR SOLONS TO CORNER CULTURE  
(By Malvina Lindsay)

If the public did not have so much interest in legendary wart cures, things might be

going better financially today for the Library of Congress. The wart situation has played into the hands of congressional paymasters much as did the long ago disclosure by the Department of Agriculture, via a bulletin, that sex had reared its ugly head among the vegetables.

The Library's operating fund has been cut by the House Committee on Appropriations to \$8,915,000, which is approximately half a million dollars below that of last year, and more than \$1 million below budget estimates. This is expected to go to a House vote tomorrow.

The subcommittee which held the hearings on this bill says this reduction is because of its feeling that the Library has gone far beyond the function for which it was created. It emphasizes that the institution is the instrument and creature of Congress, designed primarily to serve the needs of that body. Too much is being done for the public—the committee seems to think—despite a century and a half trend of legislation to expand the services of the Library and make it a wellspring of national scholarship and culture.

The villain in all this has been the wart. It has provided the usual petty, concrete, and misinterpreted example of bureaucratic extravagance. Moreover, it has a fellow conspirator, the tongue twister.

Both warts and tongue twisters (such as "Sheep shouldn't sleep in a shack") figure strongly in American folklore. Hence they were discussed in a broadcast on this subject by the Library's folklore archivist, Dr. Duncan Emrich. Many listeners sent in material on warts and limericks. Some of this was printed in the Library Information Bulletin—probably at a cost of \$25.

In Appropriations Subcommittee hearings some congressional questioners kept returning to the warts and the limericks. They interpreted the incident to mean the Library was furnishing information to the public on how to cure warts. "We are a serious people here in this Congress," declared one legislator, "and we are not interested in how to cure warts by the dark of the moon."

In fact some members of the subcommittee seemed to take a dim view generally of the Library's folklore activities, even though this section was established in 1928 as the Archive of American Folksong, with private contributions, including one from such a hardheaded financier as Andrew Mellon.

Through private grants and contributions this section has done much to preserve American folksongs, traditions, customs, local history, and recollections obtained for regional pioneers. It has incidentally furnished much material to members of Congress for radio broadcasts and speeches.

Underlying much of the testimony at the hearing was which way the Library is headed in the future. Some members of the subcommittee repeatedly stressed that the privileges extended to the public since 1800, when the institution was established, had been by courtesy of Congress. Yet each of this succession of courtesies was a legislative act. Scores were passed during the 19th century, and in 1902 the services of the Library were extended to "all qualified investigators in the States and the District of Columbia."

Expanding functions of the Library have included the handling of copyrights and a card distribution system (both of which pay their own way) the acquisition of collections of manuscripts, music, prints, a legislative reference service for Congress, the provision of books for the blind—a service added in 1952.

The Library's collection of historic papers now numbers 4 million. Scientists and scholars come by the tens of thousands from all parts of the country to study these and do other research.

Economies in recent years have curtailed many of the Library's activities. The micro-filming of newspapers, which provide history in the raw, is only done now through private contribution. The reading room provides no books from the stacks after 6 o'clock. Only 40 percent of mail requests for information are answered.

No one can dispute that the Library's first function is to serve Congress. What is most disturbing is the narrow legislative attitude shown toward its functions and its growth. Unless it expands and widens its service, it will be an increasingly feeble fountainhead of American scholarship.

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 24, 1954]

#### NATION'S LIBRARY OR THE CONGRESS?

Friends of the Library of Congress may have been puzzled by the report that funds for its maintenance and operation are to be cut drastically because it "has gone far beyond the functions for which it was originally created." A subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, has recommended an appropriation of \$8,915,000 for fiscal 1955, a slash of \$1,294,883. This reduction might be serious in itself, especially when it is taken into account that the Congress coincidentally is asking increased service of the Library. But its implications may be even more deplorable.

One of them is that the world's greatest bibliographic establishment should be specifically "an arm of the Congress" and that it should "limit its service to others to that which can be furnished with the funds and staff available." This interpretation of the Library's purpose and function admittedly does have historic precedent. The Library was a congressional property and a congressional activity when John Randolph sponsored it in 1801. It still was primarily the Library of Congress in 1815 when Thomas Jefferson's collection of 6,700 volumes was purchased and in 1867 when Peter Force's Americana—60,000 books, pamphlets, and manuscripts—were purchased.

But it also gradually became the library of the whole United States. This was indicated when it absorbed the Smithsonian Institution's bibliographic material in 1866, when the privilege of using the books in the Library was extended to the Attorney General and the members of the diplomatic corps "on the same terms and conditions as it is enjoyed by the judges of the Supreme Court" in 1816 and when its "literary and scientific collections" were opened to "scientific investigators and . . . duly qualified individuals, students, and graduates of any institution of learning in the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia" in 1902. It was even more definitely shown when the Library was made responsible for the Copyright Office in 1870.

Of course, the Library never ceased to be a particular convenience to the Congress. What happened was that specifically, by congressional authority, the Library expanded its services wherever and whenever a genuine natural demand for them developed. If the Library now "has gone far beyond the functions for which it was originally created," it has done so in response to legitimate requirements and with full congressional approval. A change of policy may be needed. That is conceivable, but if the operations of the Library are to be restricted or curtailed, it should be remembered that millions of dollars' worth of private contributions inevitably would cease being offered. The Library has been and is the people's library in terms of gifts of incalculable value given because it was the whole Nation's bibliographic depository.



Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*The Speaker's table*

For the Speaker's table, including \$2,000 for preparing Digest of the Rules, \$43,885.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. HORAN: On page 2, line 18, strike out "The Speaker's table" and insert "Office of the Parliamentarian"; and on page 2, line 19, strike out "For the Speaker's table" and insert in lieu thereof "For the Office of the Parliamentarian."

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, this is merely an amendment to improve the wording of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

*LIBRARY OF CONGRESS*

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Library of Congress not otherwise provided for, including compensation of the Librarian Emeritus, as authorized by law; development and maintenance of the Union Catalogs; custody, care, and maintenance of the Library buildings; special clothing; and expenses of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board not properly chargeable to the income of any trust fund held by the Board; \$4,500,000.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCARTHY: On page 18, line 3, after the semicolon, strike out "\$4,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,750,000."

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would restore \$250,000, bringing the total amount for salaries and expenses to \$4,750,000 instead of \$4,500,000, as is recommended in the committee bill. This will still leave an amount of approximately \$60,000 less than was appropriated in 1954, and over \$250,000 less than was estimated for 1955.

It is my opinion that the service of the Library should not be arbitrarily curtailed, as is recommended here today. I know it is an easy matter to go through a library as large as the Library of Congress and note that there are many books which are not being read; note that there are many cubicles which are not in use, and judge on the basis of these facts that the Library is not operating efficiently. We should realize that the Library does not operate in the same way as a business does; we must consider the quality of the production rather than the volume of use or quantity of production. During much of the time the facilities of the Library will not all be

in use. Scholars will leave their books in the cubicles for a week or two or longer before they can come back to examine and study the material which they have arranged. Obviously, not all of the books will be in use, and the high turnover of all books in the Library will be low. But we should take an intensive and long-range view of the operation of the Library, and for that reason we should restore at least a part of the funds which have been cut from the estimates and from what was appropriated last year.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mrs. CHURCH. I share the gentleman's concern about the reduced appropriation for the Library of Congress. I would like to ask if in recommending this overall increase the gentleman would attempt to designate whether it should be spent in specific categories?

Mr. McCARTHY. This is for "Salaries and expenses," for the general operation of the Library. I do have amendments which have reference to the Legislative Reference Service and also to the card catalog service.

Mrs. CHURCH. What would be the total amount provided by the gentleman's suggested amendments?

Mr. McCARTHY. In this particular case the amount is \$250,000. In line 11 I propose to offer an amendment to increase the appropriation for Legislative Reference by \$50,000; and in line 22, for the card catalog service, about \$50,000, or a total of \$350,000.

Mrs. CHURCH. I thank the gentleman. Could he tell me quickly what the total would be in comparison to the amount recommended by the Budget Bureau?

Mr. McCARTHY. It would be less than the estimates for 1955. I assume that is the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget. In the case of salaries and expenses, the estimates for 1955 are \$5,084,000. My recommendation is for \$4,750,000. So it is approximately \$300,000 less than is recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. In each of the other instances the amount I propose is less than was estimated by the Bureau of the Budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I should like to preface what I have to say by saying that the entire subcommittee recognizes the importance of the Library of Congress and the excellent work that it does, not only for the Congress but for the Nation.

Addressing myself specifically to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], may I

say that under "Salaries and expenses," to which this amendment refers, the expenses this year through April amounted to \$3,713,372. Projected through May and June, \$742,646, or a total of \$4,456,046 which will be used this year. So I submit that the amount that has been recommended in the bill by the committee is more than the amount which they will actually spend during the present fiscal year.

The gentleman has said that the Library does not operate as businesses do. With that I agree. I think it is about time we began to operate the Library as a business, in many instances. We have a new Librarian coming in to take over. He has not yet been confirmed. He is Librarian-Designate Mumford, from Cleveland, Ohio, who has an excellent reputation in the operation of the library there in an economic and efficient manner.

I think this bill gives him an opportunity to come in and set the Library up on a proper basis, reduce personnel where reductions are needed. I will say to you that on the question of catalogs and some of the other items that if it becomes necessary to have them—I can speak for one member of the committee and I think others would agree with me—supplementals will take care of the additional needs; I will request them. But it is important to give this new Librarian an opportunity to come in and put his house in order and to do the kind of job we expect of him.

So far as the cubicles are concerned, to which the gentleman has stated that have been occupied in some instances for several weeks by the same person, I point out to the gentleman that it is not a question of a few weeks for the cubicles, but some have been occupied by the same people since 1938. You have people now occupying cubicles in the Library of Congress who have their private telephone lines put in; and I agree with the gentleman from Ohio, my friend from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], that about the only thing we lack over there now is baths in the facilities we are furnishing. This is another matter that certainly can be carefully considered and I think it will save money for the people.

The folklore question and the limericks and the warts, and so forth have been discussed; I am not going to go into them; but I should like to point out one reason why your committee feels that economies can be effected in the Library, and as one example I will use the guard force.

They have more guards at the Library of Congress than we have on all of Capitol Hill. They have a captain, 3 senior lieutenants, 6 junior lieutenants, 10 sergeants, and the rest of the force is made up of guards. It was interesting in the hearings when we made some inquiry about the functions of those guards and the number of chiefs they had—without too many Indians. We asked: "What do these sergeants do over there, these 10 sergeants?" We were told that the sergeants make up the reports which they file and also make some assignments.

Then we asked: "What do these six lieutenants do?"

The lieutenants make sure that the sergeants make out their reports and file them and that the assignments made by the sergeants are carried out.

We believe that there are many other instances where cuts of that kind can be made cutting this budget down so that when Mr. Mumford comes in we just not give him a blanket sum and the suggestion that this or that could be cut down if it becomes necessary, but give him a definite appropriation to carry out certain functions. This will give him the opportunity to bring some order out of the chaos that has existed for some time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Legislative reference service*

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of section 203 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U. S. C. 166), \$850,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation may be used to pay any salary or expense in connection with any publication, or preparation of material therefor (except the Digest of Public General Bills), to be issued by the Library of Congress unless such publication has obtained prior approval of either the Committee on House Administration or the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOWELL: Page 18, line 11, strike out "\$850,000" and insert "\$993,837."

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I announced earlier that at this point in the bill, I would submit an amendment to provide the full budget amount of \$993,837 to the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, restoring the \$143,837 cut out by the Appropriations Committee.

I said earlier the reduction was incredible. It is just that.

The Legislative Reference Service is the expert staff of Congress itself. It was set up in the LaFollette-Monroney Act, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as a means of providing Congress with the kind of top-flight expert staff help we sorely need if we are to act intelligently on the terribly complex legislative issues which come before us.

It constitutes the one place we can go for information and analysis knowing that what we will get will be the best and most objective factual information available on the subject. Before this service was established, most members had to rely almost entirely on the self-serving "facts" submitted to Congress by lobbies and special interest groups, or by the agencies of the Federal Government with vested interests in certain legislation.

Certainly we are not looking wistfully back on those days. Certainly we are anxious to continue getting prompt and effective help from topflight research specialists who have the answers to our

most complex inquiries on legislation or know where to go to get it.

The Congressional Reorganization Act expressly provided that the Legislative Reference Service should be staffed with top experts in every field in which the Congress has standing legislative committees. It has never quite reached that level of staffing in number of experts employed—many fields provided for in the original act are not yet covered by additions to the Legislative Reference Service staff. But there is no doubt that the people who are employed as experts are outstanding in their fields. The committees of Congress regularly call upon them for assistance in drafting legislation of the most far-reaching importance. As individuals, we all make demands on these people. And the resulting service is outstanding.

Now what is the nub of the committee's complaint against the Service? It is that the Library employs in most of these top positions as senior specialists career people who work at this job all year round—yet Congress is not in session the whole year. We are told the Legislative Reference Service should hire fewer careerists and instead hire more temporary people for temporary duty while Congress is in session, and assign its career people to temporary duty during recesses to routine jobs elsewhere in the Library.

Let us consider a moment the implications of this suggested policy. Instead of top experts who make a career of serving Congress with the most informed knowledge available in their specialties, we will have a parade of temporary people taking these January-to-July jobs for experience, because they could not get lined up with a college in time for the February semester, or are otherwise unemployed. We will get good people that way only by chance and accident. The top people will go elsewhere, where they can find year-around employment and continuing tenure.

Is that the way to serve the interests of the Congress and the public? I think not.

As for assigning the career people in the Legislative Reference Service to temporary duty in other parts of the Library while Congress is out of session, the hearings show that Dr. Ernest Griffith, the Director of the Service, and a man in whom all of us have great confidence, has found the workload in his division so great even while Congress is out of session that he has not been able to spare these people. Congress—in session or out—is always churning up work for the Service; the committees are particularly demanding on Dr. Griffith's people for research.

Furthermore, I know for a fact that, in an effort to cut expenses in the Service, Dr. Griffith has encouraged his top people to take temporary outside employment in the colleges or elsewhere for short periods to reduce the payroll in the slack season. But the fact is that the season is never really slack—it is only a question of stretching appropriations enough to meet the needs.

Mr. Chairman, a vote for my amendment is not only a vote of confidence in the outstanding work done for us year in and year out by the Legislative Reference Service; it is a vote to maintain the effectiveness of the congressional process; it is a vote to make sure that Congress can continue to legislate in an informed manner rather than on the basis of doctored data supplied by pressure groups with big fish to fry at the public's expense.

Let us not cripple our good right arm in order to show some false savings in the budget. It will cost the Government dearly, Mr. Chairman, if Congress cannot quickly and effectively get informed facts and assistance from top career research people in our own Reference Service.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman realizes, I know, that the Legislative Reference Service furnishes staff assistants to committees of Congress. The Committee on Agriculture has used the service of an expert; therefore, the committee does not need to hire a man of that caliber at full time.

Mr. HOWELL. That is right.

Mr. ALBERT. By using these men in the service with the committees, both in the House and in the other body, we are effecting economies in staffing our own committees with those experts. I wonder if the committee has taken that into account?

Mr. HOWELL. What the gentleman says is absolutely true and I tried to point that up briefly in speaking on my amendment. In my opinion, it is sensible to have people who are career individuals all year round available to Members of Congress and available to committees. I hope my amendment will be adopted.

Mr. COON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWELL].

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations recommended for the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress for the 1955 fiscal year a budget of \$850,000. This is a reduction over the 1954 budget of \$51,721 and a further reduction from the amount requested of \$93,837. The Legislative Reference Service has increased in the last 10 years from \$178,000 to last year's budget of \$901,721, and within this 10-year period only once has their budget been reduced, and that was in 1948 and by the amount of \$25,000.

The Legislative Reference Service has had a constant increase in the number of requests from the Members of Congress and it is realized that the congressional Members need prompt service from the Legislative Reference; however, as I just pointed out, their budget has increased over 500 percent in this 10-year period.

I would like to call to your attention the following from the committee's report on page 4, regarding some of the



findings and practices of the Legislative Reference Service, which says:

The committee is disturbed to find that the Legislative Reference Service is engaging in legislative drafting work, normally considered to be the function of the legislative counsel. Additional funds have been provided in this bill to enable the Office of the Legislative Counsel to more adequately meet the demands for this type of service. Accordingly, the furnishing of such assistance by the Legislative Reference Service should be discontinued.

The committee is not satisfied with the manner in which the Legislative Reference Service is using its regular employees, particularly when Congress is not in session. Despite a thorough discussion of this problem during the hearings on the 1954 appropriation bill, it appears that little has been done to reassign the employees of this Service during slack periods to assist in handling workload in other parts of the Library. The committee insists that further efforts be made along this line during the coming year. It is also of the opinion that many of the contracts with other Government departments could be so arranged that the workload involved could be met during the off-season. This would have the dual benefit of making the full regular staff available to Congress while it is in session and of providing worthwhile employment for the personnel of this Service during the period when congressional workload is light.

Further, Mr. Verner W. Clapp, Acting Librarian of the Library of Congress, indicates on page 292 of the hearings that the Legislative Reference Service depends upon the Reference Department not only for them to produce the books which it needs, but also in many cases to produce the expert services which it needs. This indicates that the Legislative Reference Service has available to it, or can use, assistance and services from other departments of the Library.

I would like to mention, at this point, that nearly all of the agencies under the executive branch of the Government have been reduced in either last year's budget or this year's budget, but the Library of Congress continues to request increases in appropriations for its operation. Most of the budget estimates presented to the Appropriations Committee this year followed this pattern but it appears that the Library of Congress annually seeks an expanding budget.

The committee feels that the Library of Congress should cooperate with the administration in reducing expenses instead of increasing expenses.

The committee feels that the \$850,000 allowed to the Legislative Reference Service can adequately take care of the duties and responsibilities of this particular Service of the Library of Congress and if properly administered the Legislative Reference can continue to give efficient and prompt service to the Members of Congress as they have done in the past years.

Mr. Chairman, they told us that they have obligated through May \$695,021. So, if projected on out, that would leave for May and June, at the same rate, \$139,004. This will total to \$834,025, which will show that this year, perhaps, they are not even going to spend \$850,000 that we put in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be defeated.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Did I understand the gentleman rightly when he said that this particular item was increased 500 percent in the last 10 years?

Mr. COON. Yes, sir.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Is it not also a fact that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey would increase the amount above this year's allotment to the extent of about \$92,000?

Mr. COON. That is right.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOWELL. I think that is explainable by reason of the fact that there were a lot of in-grade pay increases and also the cost of penalty mail, which they have not been paying before.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that if they spend at the same rate they have spent in the first 10 months, that they will spend less than the current appropriation that we are carrying in this bill by \$18,000 or \$20,000?

Mr. COON. That is correct. If they spend at the current rate of expenditure, they will not spend the \$350,000 recommended in this bill.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have no disposition to quarrel with a committee that is trying to economize. I am in favor of that. But I think there is a false impression here about the work of the Legislative Reference Service. Actually, the staff of the Legislative Reference Service in 1950 was 151. That is what it is now. The workload has gone up 32 percent. If we want service from the Legislative Reference Service, I think we have got to give them adequate help. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWELL] has offered an amendment that will provide about 20 additional places on a part-time basis. I will say to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWELL] that I will vote for his amendment, but I would have been satisfied to restore the amount that the Service had last year.

Mr. COON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. COON. During the period from 1950 their appropriation went up from \$716,000 to \$901,000.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Congress raised salaries right and left, that is true. Certain grades call for certain salaries. But the number of employees in the Reference Service has not gone up. This is the department that does research work for Members of Congress.

Mr. COON. The number of permanent employees has not, but the number of temporary employees has.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The total number is 151 at the present moment. That is the same as it was 4 years ago. The amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWELL] is for 20 additional employees only. And those 20 are to work only 8 months and to be taken off when Congress adjourns.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. It is 28 new positions. I might add that the gentleman's amendment also would cover an unjustified item for a State law index of \$34,000. And the within-grade promotion amount that is included in that increase can be absorbed out of money that they will not spend this year.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The number of requests for information from Members of Congress has gone up 32 percent. What are we going to do with that? Do we not propose to serve those requests? That is the question before the House. It is all right with me if it is felt that adequate service can be obtained, but I think the most important thing is the matter of information for Members of Congress on pending legislation. I have wondered sometimes if some of the requests made to the staff actually bears directly on pending legislation, but Members of Congress have the right to seek information from the Library of Congress, and if there is not an adequate staff there, I fail to see how we are going to get that information.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I should think that the people of the country want us to do a working job. I know that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE] works very hard. So do I, and so do other Members of Congress. How can we do that without the proper tools? We cannot do our own research.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The gentleman could not go over there himself and do research work and neglect other duties.

Mr. JAVITS. I find the Library absolutely indispensable. I think if there is any justification at all for keeping our staffs small—and we certainly keep them small—it is that we are going to help the Library to do a bigger and bigger job. Our responsibilities are growing, not contracting. They are growing more complex. I strongly support the gentleman and hope the House will approve his amendment.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Personally, I think the Legislative Reference Service is the most important part of the Library, because that is the part of the Library that serves the individual Members of Congress and the committees of Congress and without it the Congress could not proceed efficiently and intelligently. That is the way I view the situation.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COON]. I do not know of any agency in the Government of the United States that has had

its appropriation increased 500 percent in the past 10 years except during the war. The Congress has cut appropriations for every agency. We cut appropriations for cancer research. We cut appropriations for research into heart disease, rheumatic fever, and so on. Every item has been cut.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Is it a question of how much the appropriation has been increased or whether we are getting our money's worth?

Mr. KIRWAN. That is not the question. Every gentleman who has gone down into the well of the House has spoken about books. I say it is not a question of books. There are enough employees over there that have another library five times as large to do the work, if it is only books that you are talking about. They have more in the Library than they have in the Smithsonian. There is everything in it but books. What they should do is to take the employees they have and work them.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman's only objection up to now has been that there has been a 500-percent increase.

Mr. KIRWAN. I do say that is wrong in that one agency.

Mr. ALBERT. I have been told by representatives of the Legislative Reference Service that the money appropriated for this year will all be used before the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. KIRWAN. We are told about the increase in cancer and heart disease, things that are more essential. I am not referring to books, I am referring to all the gadgets they have over in the Library. Books are probably the finest things on earth, or one of them. I am referring to the amount of money we are spending on the Congressional Library for everything that is not books. So as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] pointed out, if the new head of the Library takes half the employees of the Library and puts them to serving Congress, we will have a great job done for us.

Mr. ALBERT. What good are all the books over there if we do not have the facilities with which to find them and use them?

Mr. KIRWAN. We have enough over there to find the books if they stick to books, but if things continue as they are, they take every new invention and put it in the Library. They come in with 22 new employees for every invention that comes up. Such things do not belong over there. Let them stay with books.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. What are some of these new things they have?

Mr. KIRWAN. I have seen them with my own eyes. If the gentleman will take a trip through the Library he will be well rewarded.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the gentleman refer to tape recording and film recording and things of that kind?

Mr. KIRWAN. They have about everything. I have told you, not to be humorous, that there is everything but a bath and a furnished room provided in the Library. If the gentleman will take a walk over there he will be startled.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not think I will be startled, but the gentleman is talking about gadgets?

Mr. KIRWAN. I am talking about the different things over there.

Mr. McCARTHY. What are some of those things?

Mr. KIRWAN. I am telling the gentleman to take a walk through the Library.

Mr. McCARTHY. The gentleman says there is not a bathroom?

Mr. KIRWAN. That is one thing that is not there.

Mr. McCARTHY. What is there?

Mr. KIRWAN. The furnished rooms with the private phones in them. You do not know whether lobbyists or who are using them.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think maybe if a lobbyist is a citizen of our country he has a right to use them.

Mr. KIRWAN. If he is a citizen of the country, yes, but you do not know who it is. We are trying to fix it, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] said, so that when the new man comes in at the head of the Library, if there is not enough money we can give it to him. We gave them 40 employees in 1949, and the Congress has given them more since then. Now they are in here asking for 20 more, with a change of administration coming up. Every time you turn around they want more employees.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOWELL. I do not believe the gentleman would state that it is in the Legislative Reference Service they have these gadgets or whatever the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. KIRWAN. If they cut half of them out we could give the Legislative Reference Service many more employees than they have.

Mr. HOWELL. If there is something wrong, it is in some other service.

Mr. KIRWAN. As the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] said, when the new man comes in this will give him an opportunity to do that. What we are talking about is that we have provided enough money. They are not going to spend all the money they have. They are hollering that they have an increase of 32 percent in requests. They are not even going to spend the money we gave them this year.

Mr. HOWELL. They will spend the money, and they also have extra expenses, such as salary increases.

Mr. KIRWAN. They will still have money left over.

CONGRESS GETS OUTSTANDING SERVICE FROM LIBRARY OF CONGRESS AND LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWELL] has presented a convincing argument for the restoration of the full

budget amount to the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

As a new Member of Congress, but as one who has worked for many years in a congressional office, I can personally endorse his high praise of the Legislative Reference Service. It gives Congress outstanding assistance in innumerable ways.

I think if the Members here were to canvass their own staff people—the hard-working assistants in our own offices—we would get rave reports on the Legislative Reference Service. I know from personal experience how often I turned to them for help on inquiries which came in to the office. The help was always on hand and it was always good help.

I do not mean to imply that the Members do not know what goes on in their own offices when I say, however, that their clerks are able to handle innumerable problems which come up involving legislative inquiries and so on without bothering the Congressman himself until the time comes for him to use this information. I am sure many members are often amazed at how quickly their staffs get this information.

The answer—or a good part of the answer—lies in the existence of the Legislative Reference Service and in the caliber of people who staff it. I learned that as a congressional staff aide, and I have relearned it throughout this term. I have called upon them often for help, and it was always forthcoming. And it was informed and reliable and accurate.

The report of the Appropriations Committee declares that the Legislative Reference Service has been engaging in legislative drafting work normally considered the function of the Legislative Counsel. I looked up the hearings on this issue and discovered that the bill drafting work done in the Reference Service has been in cooperation with—not in competition with—the Legislative Counsel.

I would be extremely disappointed if the language of the report could be held to prohibit the kind of legislative drafting I recently asked the Legislative Reference Service to perform for me. It was in connection with my bill to establish a food-stamp plan for the distribution of surplus foods to needy families. My bill was drafted originally in the Office of the Legislative Counsel along lines I requested. Later, I received inquiries from social and philanthropic groups questioning whether certain provisions might be construed to cut off some present methods of distributing this food to worthy recipients, a consequence I had not anticipated.

At my request, the Legislative Reference Service made a special study of my bill from that standpoint and recommended changes to prevent this accidental result from occurring. This was a task primarily of analysis of legislation rather than of drafting. The drafting was incidental, but important to the analysis. I would like to ask the managers of the bill, would this language prevent me from getting that kind of



help, including suggested amendments to my own bill?

I want to make clear that any deficiencies in my original bill were my fault, not the Legislative Counsel's. They reduced to technical phraseology exactly what I said I wanted to accomplish.

I do not think we can expect the Legislative Counsel, with all of the tremendous demands upon that office for bill-drafting work, to analyze programs of government for us and, in effect, duplicate the work of the Legislative Reference Service, in connection with every bill it drafts. However, the language the committee has used in suggesting the discontinuance of any and all legislative drafting assistance by the Legislative Reference Service seems to preclude any assistance of the kind I have outlined. That would throw such a heavy burden on the Office of the Legislative Counsel, in not only drafting legislation but researching all aspects of its ramifications, that it would not be able to handle our work at all. We would then have no place to turn.

Would it not be better, Mr. Chairman, to remove this limitation on the Legislative Reference Service and encourage the continued close collaboration between that office and the Legislative Counsel, trusting to the intelligence and good sense of both offices to avoid duplication?

Since there is no language in the bill on this matter, but only the prohibition of the report, there is no basis for an amendment if the managers of the bill will amplify exactly what it is they have in mind in this respect. I hope they will do so.

Meanwhile, I want to reiterate my support for the Howell amendment to provide the full budget amount for the Legislative Reference Service, and to add my personal salute to the praise he has expressed for the excellent work it performs.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, may I take this occasion for the record to pay my tribute to the work of the Legislative Reference Service and to express the hope that Congress will do nothing that will jeopardize the work of this excellent and efficient agency. I, personally, would strongly urge that its facilities be increased, so as to permit us to make even more extensive use of it. Frankly I do not see how it can tackle the 50,000 inquiries we give it each year with a staff as small as it is.

I have had more than 30 years' service in Congress and know whereof I speak. During these years I have seen the Service grow in scope and quality. It has rendered invaluable aid not only to me personally but even more to the Judiciary Committee of which I was chairman for many years. I have learned that I can rely completely on its nonpartisan and unbiased character, and I feel that the present members of the committee of the

other party will bear me out in this. Here are just a few examples of reports prepared by the Service for our committee:

First. Committee print on internal security laws.

Second. Extradition on information filed by a public prosecuting officer.

Third. Brief on the question: Does Congress have to direct or empower the Supreme Court to promulgate a rule of ethics for attorneys practicing in Federal courts?

Fourth. State statutes of limitations and treble damage suits under the anti-trust acts.

Fifth. Assignment of judges.

Sixth. Prohibiting justices and judges from testifying as to character or reputation in Federal courts.

Seventh. Bail in criminal cases involving subversives.

You will agree, I think, that this is a formidable and important list, and there are scores of others.

I think every Member, or at least his office staff, has had reason to be grateful for the aid given in answering the many, many requests from constituents. I know I have. These are important to us and to the people back in our district who want to know about these questions.

If the staff of the Legislative Reference Service is curtailed, it is first of all we who will suffer. We need the personal attention to our research needs; we need the assurance of accuracy in information; we need the help which a skilled staff can give us which is not trying to sell us a bill of goods. These are the things which Members and committees, without regard to party or point of view, need in the interest of our great country—that we may act wisely and with an understanding of the facts. The Legislative Reference Service is our best hope for these.

I herewith submit an editorial in today's Washington Post and Times Herald:

#### NATIONAL TREASURE

The House Appropriations Committee's astounding criticism of the Library of Congress for going far beyond its original function as an agency of Congress certainly cannot be shared by most Members of Congress. They must know that the Library of Congress is one of our greatest national institutions. It is honored the world over as one of the richest storehouses of man's learning in existence. Its influence and leadership are recognized and appreciated by every library in the United States. Scholars from every State make use of it, for it has become the chief repository of papers on American history; it contains the papers of many Presidents and Secretaries of State and other invaluable manuscript material that is a part of the national heritage. In its short life of only a century and a half it has become 1 of the 3 or 4 most important libraries in the world, ranking with the British Museum and the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris.

To circumscribe its activities, as the House committee would do, would be to weaken and undermine an institution that is one of the great treasures of the American people. It is true that the Library was started as an agency of Congress, but it has grown into much more than that. It must, of course, at all times recognize the priority of the congressional claim on it, but surely only a

handful of Members of Congress believe that the Library is anything less than a property of the Nation. Instead of reducing the Library's appropriation, Congress ought to increase it. Already the Library has had to cut its hours of operation, which is a severe handicap to the scholars who wish to work there. Its staff is not large enough to give the kind of service that ought to be given, and most of the staff is woefully underpaid. The remarkable thing is that the quality of service is as high and as courteous as it is.

Yet the Appropriations Committee shamed the Library's request for funds by more than \$1.25 million. The greatest Library in the Nation, probably the greatest in the world, costs less in a year than the crop-support program costs per day. Pennypinching is not the way to preserve and to augment a national treasure.

#### THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS—ITS GREAT TREASURE SHOULD BE MAINTAINED

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWELL]. I am not in accord with the report of the committee in its recommendation to cut the 1955 budget of the Library of Congress. The adoption of the committee's recommendation would seriously injure the great work of the Library. I am disappointed with the language of the report.

Indeed the Library of Congress was first instituted for the convenience of and service to the Members of both Houses of the Congress. It is true that its duties historically have been to meet the needs of the Members of Congress first. But, Mr. Speaker, the tremendous growth of this agency is the reflection of its great usefulness to the Nation. For my part, I can say that it does a magnificent job for the Congress. But, Mr. Chairman, it is now more than just an arm of the Congress. Its benefit to students, scholars, historians, and libraries throughout the Nation is immeasurable. I think that we have the responsibility to see to it that sufficient funds are provided so that it will remain as one of the world's greatest libraries. Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD two very excellent editorials from the Washington Evening Star and the Post and Times Herald. I am in accord with the views therein expressed. I also insert telegrams from librarians in my district. They offer proof positive of the absolute necessity of maintaining the present service of the Library of Congress with particular reference to card catalog service.

(The matters referred to follow:)

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 24, 1954]

#### NATION'S LIBRARY OR THE CONGRESS?

Friends of the Library of Congress may have been puzzled by the report that funds for its maintenance and operation are to be cut drastically because it "has gone far beyond the functions for which it was originally created." A subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, has recommended an appropriation of \$8,915,000 for fiscal 1955—a slash of \$1,294,883. This reduction might be serious in itself, especially when it is taken into account that the Congress coincidentally is asking increased service of the Library. But its implications may be even more deplorable.

One of them is that the world's greatest bibliographic establishments should be specifically "an arm of the Congress" and that it should "limit its service to others to that which can be furnished with the funds and staff available." This interpretation of the Library's purpose and function admittedly does have historic precedent. The Library was a congressional property and a congressional activity when John Randolph sponsored it in 1801. It still was primarily the Library of Congress in 1815 when Thomas Jefferson's collection of 6,700 volumes was purchased and in 1867 when Peter Force's Americana—60,000 books, pamphlets, and manuscripts—were purchased.

But it also gradually became the library of the whole United States. This was indicated when it absorbed the Smithsonian Institution's bibliographic material in 1866, when the privilege of using the books in the Library was extended to the Attorney General and the members of the diplomatic corps "on the same terms and conditions as it is enjoyed by the judges of the Supreme Court" in 1816 and when its "literary and scientific collections" were opened to "scientific investigators and . . . duly qualified individuals, students, and graduates of any institution of learning in the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia" in 1902. It was even more definitely shown when the Library was made responsible for the Copyright Office in 1870.

Of course, the Library never ceased to be a particular convenience to the Congress. What happened was that, specifically by congressional authority, the Library expanded its services wherever and whenever a genuine natural demand for them developed. If the Library now "has gone far beyond the functions for which it was originally created," it has done so in response to legitimate requirements and with full congressional approval. A change of policy may be needed. That is conceivable, but if the operations of the Library are to be restricted or curtailed, it should be remembered that millions of dollars' worth of private contributions inevitably would cease being offered. The Library has been and is the people's library in terms of gifts of incalculable value given because it was the whole Nation's bibliographic depository.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 25, 1954]

#### NATIONAL TREASURE

The House Appropriations Committee's astounding criticism of the Library of Congress for going far beyond its original function as an agency of Congress certainly cannot be shared by most Members of Congress. They must know that the Library of Congress is one of our greatest national institutions. It is honored the world over as one of the richest storehouses of man's learning in existence. Its influence and leadership are recognized and appreciated by every library in the United States. Scholars from every State make use of it, for it has become the chief repository of papers on American history; it contains the papers of many Presidents and Secretaries of State and other invaluable manuscript material that is a part of the national heritage. In its short life of only a century and a half it has become 1 of the 3 or 4 most important libraries in the world, ranking with the British Museum and the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris.

To circumscribe its activities, as the House committee would do, would be to weaken and undermine an institution that is one of the great treasures of the American people. It is true that the Library was started as an agency of Congress, but it has grown into much more than that. It must, of course, at all times recognize the priority

of the congressional claim on it, but surely only a handful of Members of Congress believe that the library is anything less than a property of the Nation. Instead of reducing the library's appropriation, Congress ought to increase it. Already the library has had to cut its hours of operation, which is a severe handicap to the scholars who wish to work there. Its staff is not large enough to give the kind of service that ought to be given, and most of the staff is woefully underpaid. The remarkable thing is that the quality of service is as high and as courteous as it is.

Yet the Appropriations Committee slashed the library's request for funds by more than \$1.25 million. The greatest library in the Nation, probably the greatest in the world, costs less in a year than the crop-support program costs per day. Penny pinching is not the way to preserve and to augment a national treasure.

SOUTH HADLEY, MASS., May 24, 1954.  
Congressman EDWARD P. BOLAND,  
House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.:

If House Appropriation Committee recommendation to reduce Library of Congress budget is approved operating expenses of local libraries will be increased. By selling its printed cards to libraries throughout the United States, the Library helps to reduce our costs. Furthermore the card catalog service is more than self-supporting, produces profit to Treasury and helps to defray costs of cataloging Library of Congress holdings. Proposed cut in salary budget will work further hardship on libraries depending on Library of Congress for loan of books, biographical and other services. Sincerely hope you will back restoration of all or generous part of proposed reduction.

FLORA S. LUDINGTON,  
Librarian, Mount Holyoke College.

AMHERST, MASS., May 24, 1954.  
Hon. EDWARD P. BOLAND,  
House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.:

Tomorrow appropriations committee reports Library of Congress bill. Important that recommended cut in request not be approved. Urge your support of restoration at least to level of present year. Pointless to cut card catalog service which operates at a profit.

NEWTON F. McKEON,  
Director, Amherst College Library.

NORTHAMPTON, MASS., May 24, 1954.  
Hon. EDWARD P. BOLAND,  
House of Representatives:

Public libraries depended on Library of Congress cataloging and card services. Hope you will work to restore budget cuts.

LAWRENCE WIKANDER,  
Forbes Library.

NORTHAMPTON, MASS., May 24, 1954.  
Hon. EDWARD P. BOLAND,  
House of Representatives:

Strongly urge your support in at least partial restoration of Library of Congress fund now in process of being cut one-half million below current year's appropriation. Cut of \$64,000 for Library of Congress printed cards would be financial hardship on all libraries throughout the country. Also cutting the one operation which is more than self-supporting to the United States Treasury. Salary cuts would be felt by libraries throughout the country as bibliographical and interlibrary loan services would have to be curtailed.

MARGARET L. JOHNSON,  
Librarian, Smith College Library.

SPRINGFIELD, MASS., May 25, 1954.  
Hon. EDWARD P. BOLAND,  
House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.:

Proposed Library of Congress budget cut is matter of deep concern to local libraries. All public libraries and institutions of learning are dependent on bibliographic services offered through the Library. Services offered on nationwide basis would be prohibitive in cost for individual libraries. Libraries already share in costs of these services through subscriptions and direct payment. We respectfully request that you consider giving your support to restoration of vitally needed funds to Library of Congress budget.

JOHN A. HUMPHRY,  
Library Director, City Library Association, Springfield, Mass.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOWELL) there were—ayes 31, noes 52.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### Distribution of catalog cards

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the preparation and distribution of catalog cards and other publications of the Library, \$1,200,000.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. CHURCH: On page 18, line 22, strike out "\$1,200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,250,000."

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the House that during my entire period of service, this is only the second time that I have offered an amendment to increase any item in an appropriation bill. I do so now only because I have become convinced because of the great services of the Library of Congress that this appropriation should be increased by the \$50,000 which my amendment asks. I would point out to you most respectfully that by this increase we would still not be giving the amount sought by the Library of Congress for this purpose; and we would still be keeping the amount below the appropriation for 1954. In 1954, the amount allotted was \$1,264,800. The estimate for 1955 was \$1,558,757. If we vote the \$50,000 additional, which I have asked, we shall still be far below the estimate for 1955 and we shall still be \$14,880 below the amount appropriated for 1954. I wonder that there is no agency connected with the Government which more deserves the support of this body than does the Library of Congress. Certainly, there is no agency which has so helped me and I cannot see but that it is actually to our credit that we are making more and more demands upon the Library. I certainly think that we ought to give it the full measure of our studied support, and I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. This is one place in the Library where our projection shows that they will actually obligate their total funds for the year. I have no objection



to the committee accepting this amendment, which has been offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. HOWELL. I wonder if you feel that this amount will really be sufficient to do the job which is necessary there. I know they do a great deal of work for libraries throughout the country in cataloging and sending them catalog cards, and they get paid for that at cost plus a 10-percent profit to the Government. Their estimate shows that they will probably need a bit more than this.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. That is not true, and I do not know how that information got out. They are actually losing about \$100,000 this year, and not making a 10-percent profit.

Mr. HOWELL. On that particular phase of it, however, where they supply catalog cards to other libraries, I think they make money, or, at least, come out even.

Mr. HORAN. No; they do not.

Mrs. CHURCH. If I may answer the gentleman's question, I would state that while I have not made a personal investigation, I have it upon very excellent authority that this increase of \$50,000 would meet the need.

Mr. HOWELL. I compliment the gentleman for introducing the amendment, and I certainly shall support it.

Mrs. CHURCH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I certainly shall support the gentleman's amendment. I think the RECORD should show that whereas card cataloging is not making a profit, something like 80 percent of the cost of this service is borne by non-governmental services, and so if they get that \$50,000 restoration it might have the effect of increasing the service by approximately \$200,000, because 80 percent of the cost is borne by nongovernmental sources.

Mrs. CHURCH. We should hope that such a gain would be achieved.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9203) making appropriations for the legislative branch and the judiciary branch for the fiscal

year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 555, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any of the amendments? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the bill may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

#### INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION OF FIREWORKS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 116) to amend title 18, United States Code, so as to prohibit the transportation of fireworks into any State in which the sale or use of such fireworks is prohibited, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, lines 8 and 9, strike out "knowingly imports or."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "unless" and insert "knowing that."

Page 2, line 3, strike out "and" and insert "or."

Page 2, line 3, strike out "not."

Page 2, line 3, after "State", insert "specifically prohibiting or regulating the use of fireworks."

Page 2, line 7, strike out "or to a freight forwarder" and insert "or to international or domestic water carriers."

Page 2, line 8, after "commerce", insert "or to the transportation of fireworks into a State for the use of Federal agencies in the carrying out or the furtherance of their operations."

Page 2, line 14, strike out "Columbia." and insert "Columbia."

Page 2, after line 14, insert:

"This section shall be effective from and after July 1, 1954."

At the end of the bill add the following new section:

"Sec. 3. This act shall not be effective with respect to—

"(1) the transportation of fireworks into any State or Territory for use solely for agricultural purposes,

"(2) the delivery of fireworks for transportation into any State or Territory for use solely for agricultural purposes, or

"(3) any attempt to engage in any such transportation or delivery for use solely for agricultural purposes,

until 60 days have elapsed after the commencement of the next regular session of the

legislature of such State or Territory which begins after the date of enactment of this act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY AND NAVAL INSTALLATIONS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 558, Rept. No. 1680), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9242) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations and for the Alaska Communications System, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

#### RECOMMITTAL OF BILL

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 5183) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of the Board of County Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kans., be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary for consideration of an amendment. I have cleared this with the majority and minority leaders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

#### THE JOHN DAY PROJECT ON THE COLUMBIA RIVER

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to authorize cooperation in development of the John Day project on the Columbia River.

This bill represents another step in working out a partnership policy for the development of our rivers.

Senator GUY CORDON deserves high praise for the leadership he has shown in the development of this legislation. Senator CORDON and my distinguished colleague, HARRIS ELLSWORTH, also deserve great credit for their earlier legislation to authorize partnership development of Cougar Dam.

Hearings should be held promptly on this bill, so that construction at John Day can begin as soon as possible. But we must also make sure that the hearings are careful and thorough. All persons who desire to speak on this bill must be given a chance to be fully heard. All aspects of the legislation must be examined. We must do all we can to make certain that this partnership is a sound and fair one, from the standpoint of all the people, and from the view of far-sighted resource development.

In this, as in the Cougar legislation, we are not merely proposing to develop a dam site—we will be testing the partnership idea. If we are successful, we will set a pattern for other partnership developments throughout the Northwest and the Nation.

#### EAST-WEST TRADE—CHARGES MADE AND ANSWERED

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, on last Wednesday, the 19th of May, certain charges were widely published as emanating from the Congress on the subject of trade between the free world and the Soviet bloc. It was charged that Britain and presumably other western countries are shipping weapons of war to Communist China. It was further alleged that the Foreign Operations Administration is refusing to give the facts about East-West trade to the Congress and the public. And other statements were made critical of our allies and of the Eisenhower administration. The charges made, and especially the implications sought to be drawn from them, are unwarranted by the facts, and the best way to deal with the charges is to state the facts.

It happens that I am in a position to have some knowledge of the facts of the matter by virtue of the inquiry that has been made into this subject by the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy, of which I have the honor to be chairman. I feel it my duty, therefore, to speak to the subject, and I have obtained additional information bearing on the specific charges made.

Now, upon what are the charges based that our allies are shipping weapons and other sinews of military strength to Communist China?

They seem to be built largely on an erroneous interpretation of a statement made in the House of Commons by Peter Thorneycroft, president of the British Board of Trade. The statement was made on March 30, after the United States, the United Kingdom, and France had exchanged views concerning certain adjustments that are to be made in the

international program of strategic trade controls, as pertaining to shipments to the European Soviet bloc, not to Communist China. The reasons for these adjustments in the controls over shipments to the European Soviet bloc were explained in detail before the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy on February 16, and they have been carefully explained by Government officials on other occasions as well.

Mr. Thorneycroft stated that any relaxation of controls must be fully compatible with security requirements. His statement was three paragraphs in length, and the full text is as follows:

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, and with the permission of the House, I should like to make a statement on the discussions which have taken place this week with Mr. Stassen, representing the United States Government, and M. Maurice Schumann, representing the French Government, on the subject of East-West trade. We discussed questions affecting both the scope and the enforcement of the controls over the export of strategic goods to the countries of the Soviet bloc.

We found ourselves in full agreement that, while controls must be maintained on exports of goods which would add directly and significantly to the Soviet bloc's military capabilities, especially, of course, in unconventional weapons, we should seek a substantial relaxation of the controls on other goods and an expansion of civilian trade. I would emphasize that such a relaxation is fully compatible with security requirements.

On this agreed basis, we shall now proceed to discuss with other friendly governments the detailed application of this policy. Our proposal to them will be that we should examine the scope and effect of the controls, category by category, the whole operation taking 2 or 3 months; but it is our hope to introduce agreed changes by stages and the House may be assured that we shall avoid needless delay. At the same time, the House will appreciate that there can be no question of relaxing any controls except after full discussion with other friendly governments who are equally concerned.

As a basis of the charges to which I have referred, only one sentence of the Thorneycroft statement was selected. That sentence reads as follows:

We found ourselves in full agreement that, while controls must be maintained on exports of goods which would add directly and significantly to the Soviet bloc's military capabilities, especially, of course, in unconventional weapons, we should seek a substantial relaxation of the controls on other goods and an expansion of civilian trade.

It was then charged that the words "especially, of course, in unconventional weapons" had only one meaning: "that they plan to ship conventional weapons of war," such things as "artillery, tanks, antiaircraft guns, radar, jet planes."

This was a perfectly amazing interpretation, without foundation, in what was said by Mr. Thorneycroft, who in emphasizing controls on unconventional weapons could certainly not be said to imply that conventional weapons were to be shipped.

As Harold E. Stassen, Director of the Foreign Operations Administration, promptly stated, following the charges, all of the allied countries cooperating in the international group of 15 nations—the leading trading nations of

the world—ban the shipment of any weapons whatsoever, conventional or unconventional, to any part of the Soviet bloc, either in Europe or Asia, and that they will continue to ban them.

No country has suggested that the embargo be ended on weapons, nor on any other kind of munitions, nor on atomic energy materials. As a matter of fact, many nonmunitions items which contribute directly and significantly to war-making power remain on the embargo lists.

There is no plan and has been no plan to start shipping weapons to any country under Moscow's domination; that would be unthinkable.

The charges, however, did not stop with the accusation that the British plan to ship weapons. The charge was made that our allies are already shipping such things.

Mr. Thorneycroft's words have been depicted as being an official statement in the House of Commons that our allies are shipping "antiaircraft guns and artillery and other weapons of war" which are being relayed to Indochina where they may kill American boys.

The fact is that our Government represents that our allies, including the NATO countries, with whom we work very closely in the program of strategic trade controls, have shipped no munitions to the U. S. S. R. and its satellites, either in Europe or Asia, and our Government is confident that they will not do so.

According to public reports sent to Congress by the Foreign Operations Administration, the sum total of all goods on the Battle Act embargo list which were knowingly permitted to be shipped to the Soviet bloc in 1952 and 1953 by all the countries receiving aid from the United States amounted to about \$15 million. This information was also brought out in the hearings before the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy—pages 18-19—which were made available to the public. Under the provisions of the law, the President himself has reviewed the circumstances in each case and has directed the continuance of United States aid to the countries involved, because the President found the cessation of aid would have been clearly detrimental to the security of the United States.

Of this \$15 million, 74 percent was prior commitments—that is, commitments made before the Battle Act went into effect. None of the \$15 million was munitions or atomic energy materials. Only \$98 of it went to Communist China—all the rest to the European Soviet bloc. The \$98 that went to Communist China—it was in 1952—consisted of \$66 worth of lubricating oils and greases and \$32 worth of gages for a sugar-processing plant.

Compared with the \$15 million over a 2-year period, the total amount of exports from the entire free world to the Soviet bloc in the same 2 years was \$2.7 billion. This is only around 2 percent of total free world trade.

The facts about the China trade have been regularly reported to Congress by



the Foreign Operations Administration. Most of our allies do trade with Communist China, but in nonstrategic goods. Under a United Nations resolution they maintain a strict embargo over strategic materials. This embargo is still firmly in effect. The cooperating governments are not relaxing it. Since they trade with Communist China, they send their ships there. But they have regulations prohibiting these ships from carrying strategic goods from any country to Communist China. Free-world exports to Communist China have been declining; they decreased from \$159 million in the first half of 1953 to \$111 million in the second half of the year. These facts were not mentioned in the charges.

Rubber exports are important and I would certainly not want to see any rubber exported to the Communist bloc, but the charges concerning rubber should not be permitted to be inaccurate. My information is that the United States consumed 1,335,000 tons of new rubber in 1953, of which 553,000 tons were natural rubber. Of course, only a fraction of this went for military purposes. Yet, it was charged our peacetime economy requires only 40,000 tons a year by way of stressing the significance of rubber shipments of 194,000 tons in 1952 to the Soviet bloc. It was not mentioned that these shipments fell to 147,000 tons in 1953 and that of this 147,000 tons, 58,000 tons were shipped from Ceylon to Communist China. Ceylon receives no United States aid and is not a member of the United Nations. The rest of the rubber went to the European Soviet bloc.

It was also charged that Malaya got caviar and other insignificant shipments in return for the rubber it shipped to Russia. I am informed that Malaya has made no direct shipments of rubber to the Soviet Union since March 1952, and that when she did make direct shipments she was paid in sterling, which she could use to buy goods in the free world. Also, that for the last 2 years any shipments of Malayan rubber to Russia have gone through the United Kingdom. This trade has taken a very great drop. In fact, Britain's reexports to the Soviet Union of rubber from all her colonies, including Malaya, have amounted to only 5 tons in the first 4 months of 1954.

The strategic trade-control system is a multilateral effort, in which many countries are in constant and close consultation, and in which the cooperation has been, by and large, very good.

It is not a service to our national interest to speak of allowing other countries to do this or that, as though they were not independent countries at all, but merely our puppets, which they are distinctly not.

Our aid to other countries helps make the whole free world secure, including our own Nation, and it cannot be cut off without having critically detrimental effects on the national security of the United States.

The organization of the economic defense program in our own Government is not merely a program of the Foreign Operations Administration, but involves 10 agencies which work closely together,

including State, Defense, Commerce, Treasury, the Central Intelligence Agency, and others. The overall policy is not set by any one department but by the President and the National Security Council, and the implementation of the policy is the joint responsibility of the Secretary of State and the Director of Foreign Operations—see pages 5 and 6 of Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy hearings.

It is true, of course, that some information concerning strategic trade controls cannot be made public for security reasons. On many occasions classified testimony on this and other subjects have been given to committees of Congress in executive sessions by members of the executive branch.

The Foreign Operations Administration and other Government agencies have not refused to cooperate with the Congress in bringing out the facts about the program. They are, on the contrary, anxious to convey the facts to anyone who will listen.

I am glad to make a statement on this from first-hand experience. On February 16 of this year, the FOA's principal East-West trade officials came before our subcommittee and testified jointly with State Department representatives. They testified in detail upon the economic defense policy of the Government, the objectives of that policy, the organization within the Government for carrying out the policy, the current changes of emphasis in the program, and the current trends in East-West trade. The subcommittee considered this testimony of such importance that its publication would be in the public interest. Hence the subcommittee published the hearings, along with a number of charts, on March 14. It was widely distributed and publicized in the press. The charges do not reflect consideration of this document.

On April 9, Mr. Stassen appeared before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and publicly testified concerning the current adjustments in the control program. These hearings also were printed.

On May 17, only 2 days before the charges to which I refer were made, the Director of FOA sent to Congress the fourth semiannual Battle Act report, entitled "East-West Trade Trends." This book contains 102 pages and abounds with facts and figures about East-West trade. A copy was sent to every Member of Congress. It received very wide attention in the press on May 17. The charges do not reflect consideration of this report.

In addition to this report and the hearings, the executive branch sends other reports on East-West trade to Congress from time to time. These reports are sent to the six committees which are named in the Battle Act as being the committees which are to receive such reports. These are the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, and the Armed Services Committees and Appropriations Committees of both Houses.

Another charge made was that the FOA had refused to tell the Congress

what strategic commodities were being shipped to the Soviet bloc by our allies. This is not correct. On the contrary the committee of which I am a member has received the periodic reports which the President and Mr. Stassen have sent to the six committees, describing in detail the shipments of Battle Act embargo items which have been made. As I said earlier, these shipments totaled about \$15 million in the first 2 years of the Battle Act, and they included no weapons whatsoever, and the strategic goods which went to Communist China amounted to the great sum of \$98.

Distortions of fact inherent in the charges sow dissension and distrust and can only do harm to the efforts of our country to maintain the anti-Communist struggle in cooperation with other countries. That is why I have felt it my duty, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy, to supply some facts today.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to what is perhaps the most cynical and tragic of all the charges. This is the charge that if free-world ships were prevented from going to Communist China, "the war in Indochina will dry up and die overnight" because of the "lack of munitions."

Mr. Speaker, I only wish that this were so, but it is not so.

Charges made to the American people that the war in Indochina would dry up overnight if our allies would only stop allowing their ships to visit Communist China, can have the effect of cruelly raising false hopes on the part of Americans who might not possess the facts on which to judge the truth. Charges like this are more likely to damage than help the cause of freedom in the world.

It is a prime and well-established policy of world communism to drive wedges between the non-Communist countries. Unsubstantiated charges which give a false impression of the trade of our allies with the Communist bloc do not fight communism but tend to sow suspicion and distrust, the very climate the Communists wish to spread in the free world.

We seek with justification to bring about a complete embargo of all trade even if non-strategic with Communist China, and we strive to see that the Soviet bloc does not have war making power in any way. We must recognize that our allies are not trading in munitions nor other strategic goods; that they get more out of this foreign trade to keep their economies strong than they give, thereby reducing their need for foreign aid; that they obtain goods from Communist China which they need, in return for the goods they ship to that country; that they are sovereign nations, entitled to make decisions regarding their own trade; that they are generally cooperating extremely well in the mutual defense program and in the control of strategic goods; and that if we followed extremist advice we would drive away our friends and be left alone in the world, to the mortal danger of our national safety and our free institutions. The dangers inherent in breaking up the free

world's anti-Communist cooperation is clearly apparent to us all today.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman has not touched on the general question of trade between the East and the West.

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman will.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think that is every bit as important as the question of whether or not you are exchanging armaments or whether they are being shipped there. I think we are all conscious of the fact that the sinews of any country rest on the trade that they have with the rest of the world. Let me give the gentleman just 1 or 2 examples. Last summer in Vienna, I went out to the Vienna Trade Fair. The largest exhibit there, by far, and which would have encompassed the three largest of the other exhibitors, were the Russians. They had there every form of trade imaginable, from pharmaceuticals to automobiles, tractors, plows, farm equipment of all kinds. Poland was there under the same circumstances, as well as Rumania and Bulgaria, all of them seeking trade in what I would call west of the Iron Curtain. Now, I think, if we are going to make any progress in world trade, we have to counter this. I will ask the gentleman if he is familiar with the trade bill which has been introduced by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HARRISON], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUD], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE], and myself and at least two other Members of this House, which will make the interchange of currencies easy so that we may enter into this trade race which has been running in Europe. I just brought that up because I thought it was awfully important on this question of trade. It is just as important that we enter into the matter of getting commercial trade as it is in preventing arms going behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. JAVITS. If the gentleman will allow me, first, it is necessary to lay at rest charges of the utmost seriousness as to the relationship between ourselves and our free-world allies.

Mr. SPRINGER. I agree with the gentleman that far.

Mr. JAVITS. Then I shall be very glad to deal with the subject of nonstrategic trade to which the gentleman refers, and I will before I am through.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOWELL. I want to commend the gentleman on the statement he is making. It is very important at this time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Has the gentleman any views to express on the lifting of trade restrictions in the Communist bloc in Europe which has been suggested recently? Does the gentleman approve of that?

Mr. JAVITS. I would like to address myself to that, I will say to the gentleman. I must get in this information about strategic trade, and if the gentleman will bear with me, I will cover the subject.

First, as to the strategic trade, the facts show that within the last 2 years the shipment of strategic materials behind the Iron Curtain—and this is not weapons but what could be otherwise useful in war—amounted to slightly under \$15 million, of which 74 percent was in prior commitments, that is, contracts which had already been made, and the President in each case found that the cessation of aid to the country which participated in any such shipment would clearly have been detrimental to the security of the United States. He made a specific finding in each case to that effect. None of the \$15 million was munitions or atomic-energy materials. And incidentally, only \$98—not thousands or millions, but \$98—went to Communist China. All the rest went to the European Soviet bloc.

This \$15 million—and this brings me to the point which the gentlemen have raised—this \$15 million in strategic materials over a 2-year period compared with exports from the entire free world to the Soviet bloc in the same 2 years of \$2,700,000,000. That, in turn, must be juxtaposed to imports from the Soviet bloc in excess of that amount. The figures are, for 1953, estimated exports of \$1,575,000,000 to the Soviet bloc, including Communist China, and an estimate of imports from the bloc of \$1,929,000,000.

This is the nub of the controversy. If we are to prohibit completely all nonstrategic trade with Iron Curtain countries, then we have to be prepared to proceed with dispatch with legislation such as my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] referred to, which will tend to integrate the free world and give the countries of the free world the opportunities and the facilities for trading with each other so that they can supplant this trade with the Iron Curtain countries, and we have to open up new markets and new demand for goods in the free world. If we do not, we have to put up that amount of aid. Because it is a fact that there has been a tremendous reduction in the volume of export and import business between the 12 free European OEEC countries and the European countries behind the Iron Curtain; it is 2.6 percent West European exports and 2.5 percent of such West European imports compared with 10.2 percent of exports and 11 percent of imports before World War II.

And if we do not want these countries to deal with the Soviet bloc in terms of the timber and the grain for which the Soviet bloc has been the traditional source of supply of Western Europe, which has been so very materially cut now, as I said a minute ago, then we have to either make it up in aid or we have to do an infinitely better job of integrating the free world in terms of trade.

The fact is, the essential determinant today for the trade which we counte-

nance with the Iron Curtain countries is trade upon which the balance of necessity and convenience and value is in favor of the free world as against the Communist world. It is purely a selfish proposition and evaluated in that way on each specific item of trade. I think it is extremely important that the people understand that.

No one would like better than I to embargo completely all trade with Iron Curtain countries. I think it would be a tremendously effective weapon to liberate the enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain. But I submit that if we are going to have to face that, we have got to face a bill for several billions in additional foreign aid ourselves which our people will not accept.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say to the gentleman that here is the kind of weapon that they are using economically against us. On the day that I was in Paris, I talked with the American Ambassador, Mr. Dillon. He had just been notified by the French Government on this day that at the Lyons Fair, which is the largest one in France traditionally, the Russians for this year 1954 have offered to build a building, something that had never been allowed before in the Lyons Fair, of some \$1 million. And the goods which they were going to bring into this fair and which they had listed, were farm machinery, tractors—the very things which we had been supplying to France in our trade during the past 15 years.

I think the gentleman has indicated the crux of the problem; that somehow we must meet this threat in Europe which the Iron Curtain countries are making to our own competition.

May I put this question to the gentleman? Is not our trouble the fact that there is a dollar shortage, there is not an earning power of dollars? Am I right in that?

Mr. JAVITS. First may I say that the Communist offers of business are very often faked for propaganda purposes and they really have nothing to sell when cornered by an offer. Second, the difficulty is we do not have enough markets in the free world to substitute for their Communist bloc markets—that is more important even than dollars.

Mr. SPRINGER. But is it not largely a question of the exchange of money? If you had a common currency, you probably would be able to exchange these without any difficulty.

Mr. JAVITS. Currency convertibility will help but currency alone will not do it. You have got to have markets. And that means the development of the underdeveloped areas, and the opening up of new markets which would need to be supplied.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman has just mentioned the figure \$2 billion and over which the Iron Curtain countries have done in trade with western countries in Europe; am I right in that?

Mr. JAVITS. That is right, with the whole free world.



Mr. SPRINGER. Is not that the market we should be seeking?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes, but please note the free Europeans have to sell before they can buy.

Mr. SPRINGER. What you have had there is what is generally known as barter, or what is known as a bilateral arrangement, in which you have exchange of goods for goods.

Mr. JAVITS. That is what the Soviet bloc has done.

Mr. SPRINGER. Our State Department does not approve of that sort of thing, and I am not so sure I do, either, after having seen all the countries of Western Europe to which the gentleman was referring. I was in every one of them except Yugoslavia on this side of the Iron Curtain. I talked with members of the Foreign Operations Administration there and with the representatives of the State Department in every one of those countries. The only thing we can do is make possible an exchange of currencies. I think the bill I mentioned awhile ago makes that possible, so that we can sell our surplus produce in those countries.

Mr. JAVITS. My thesis is that you have to open up markets, and markets mean human needs, increasing production in areas where production is very low today. This is the whole problem of the development of the undeveloped areas. Only when you do that will you afford markets which Europe needs both in getting the raw materials it needs, which it now must acquire in fact behind the Iron Curtain, or in selling its own output of manufactured goods. This is a job on which we have fallen down, and the evidence of our failure is contained in the continuance of this trade in nonstrategic materials with the governments behind the Iron Curtain.

Let me emphasize that the trade relatively speaking is small. It amounts to roughly 2 percent of the whole trade of the free world, and it has been falling, which is a very, very important consideration.

I would like to emphasize that I am deeply concerned with the gentleman's discussion, but I think the important thing to nail down today is that our allies are not knifing us in the back in terms of East-West trade in weapons or strategic goods.

The allegations about the shipping of arms, ammunition, and so forth to our deadly enemies lead only to suspicion and distrust, which of all times we can least afford today. I think that at all times this has to be said and reiterated and proven. That was my purpose in taking the floor today.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Along the line of the questions the gentleman was asking about this Lyons Fair, I have read in the past few days that whereas the Soviets were going to make this big splurge about what they had to sell, and had a rather fancy line of samples, the result was that when they got all through they did not

have much to sell, and what they had to offer was on such terms that nobody wanted to buy it. I wonder if the gentleman could comment on that?

Mr. JAVITS. No question about it. The facts are that of the total imports from the European Soviet bloc by the United Kingdom, for example, an aggregate of about 90 percent is in food and raw materials. The Russians and satellites are not selling manufactured goods, they are showing them around to make an impression that they have them to sell, but when it comes down to cases they do not have them to sell. But more than that, with all the fanfare the British were going to make with the Russians to sell them goods, British-Russian trade has fallen, not increased. It is a Communist fraud, but it is a fraud which is serious to the free world unless we meet it not only in terms of denunciation but in terms of actually recognizing that we have to have new markets if you want to replace these old markets, and that Europe has to have a supply of raw materials from what you call soft-currency countries if you are going to replace entirely their traditional suppliers behind the Iron Curtain. A perfectly remarkable job has been done already in cutting down the business between the free world and the Communist world.

#### THE OIL INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANFIELD). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 3 and 4, 1954, the board of directors of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, meeting at Denver, Colo., adopted a resolution relating to this Nation's increasing dependency on imported oil.

As a Representative of the Fifth District of Oklahoma, an area composed of five oil-producing counties, I find this resolution to be of vital interest to the people in my district. It is also of direct concern to Members of Congress from the 29 other States which now produce oil. Most important, however, because of its bearing on the national security, this resolution deals with a subject of primary significance to the elected representatives of every State of the Union. For these reasons, I insert this resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

RESOLUTION ON PETROLEUM IMPORTS ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA MIDYEAR MEETING, DENVER, COLO., MAY 3-4, 1954

The welfare and safety of the United States depend upon adequate oil supplies. President Eisenhower recognized this in speaking to the American people less than a month ago. He pointed out that Russia produced less than half a billion barrels of oil yearly as compared with 2¼ billion in this country. United States production of oil and steel, he said, "are deterrents upon men in the Kremlin. They are factors that make war, let us say, less likely."

Sufficient domestic oil is the backbone and the first line of our national defense. The fundamental issue involved in the question of oil imports, therefore, is preserving the strength of a vital American industry—oil and gas production. Excessive imports undermine that strength. As domestic producers our primary objective is, and must be, to continue to find enough oil to keep pace with increasing national requirements. When excessive imports endanger that goal we have a right and a duty to demand corrective action.

At the last annual meeting of this association, October 1953, we cited the harm being inflicted upon the domestic industry by a continued high rate of imports. At that time there was an obvious and urgent need to effectuate a sound import policy. We were concerned with the effectiveness of a solution, not with the means. We urged, therefore, the consideration of all possible solutions and invited the cooperation of all elements of the petroleum industry. To this end we recommend that—

1. The importing companies voluntarily reduce imports to the proper levels;

2. The President of the United States and appropriate Government agencies take such action within the proper authority to accomplish this same objective;

3. If excessive imports should continue, without effective correction by all other possible means, then and only then should a solution be sought through legislative action.

Since that program was adopted more than 6 months ago, sincere and tireless efforts have been made to solve the import problem, short of legislation. This association has joined others in these efforts. Today we face the following facts:

First, Imports of crude oil and refined products have not been reduced, and are scheduled to increase further during 1954.

Second, The availability of domestic oil—primary factor set out by the National Petroleum Council for measuring the proper level of imports—proves that imports are supplanting domestic oil to an increasing extent. The latest figures show that we now have a shut-in domestic capacity of one and three-quarter million barrels daily, available at efficient rates of production.

Third, Repeated reductions in domestic production without corresponding reductions in imports have continued to violate the principles of equity to which the industry also has subscribed through the National Petroleum Council.

Fourth, A progressive weakening in the ability of the domestic oil industry to meet national needs would be the inevitable and disastrous result should excessive imports continue and thereby prevent necessary expansion in this country.

The facts show imports to be excessive by every accepted standard. Imports of both crude oil and fuel oil have an established and accepted place in United States foreign trade. Excessive shut-in domestic production, or depressed fuel oil markets below parity with competing fuels, have constituted evidence that imports have gone beyond justifiable levels.

Importing companies have had an opportunity to act, individually and voluntarily. Reductions by some have been offset by increases by others. No doubt remains that industrial statesmanship has failed to provide an overall and assured solution.

Likewise, no solution has yet been formulated through administrative agencies of the Federal Government. The report of the Randall Commission on Foreign Economic Policy dealt with foreign trade in general. The proposed 3-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act calls for further tariff reductions and encouragements to imports of all commodities. The answer to the specific

problem of oil imports can and must be solved within the framework of general trade policy and sound foreign trade relations.

The dangers confronting the domestic-oil industry are real and immediate. Further delay leads to dependency on foreign oil. We must not render our country defenseless in one of the most vital munitions of war.

As in the past, we would support a prompt and effective solution by any means short of legislation. Such a means being not now available or forthcoming, our national interest impels us to act before it is too late. Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the board of directors of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, as approved by its executive committee, That the Congress of the United States be urged immediately to enact legislation to correct the conditions created by excessive oil imports which now endanger our Nation's security; and be it further*

*Resolved, That cooperation and support are invited from all elements of the petroleum industry and from all those whose future welfare and security also demand a strong and capable petroleum-producing industry in the United States.*

This resolution represents the thinking of many of the people in my district. My State has, in the past year, felt the impact of the ever-increasing volume of foreign oil. It anticipates an intensification of this situation in the months to come. The potential consequences to my district's economic welfare are both obvious and forbidding. The potential consequences to the State and Nation are similarly bleak. They must be prevented.

As evidence of the situation in Oklahoma, I would like to quote from a letter sent to me by Mr. Roland V. Rodman, president of Anderson-Prichard Oil Corp. Mr. Rodman states:

Oklahoma has lost a great deal of her market. Formerly, we exported a substantial amount of oil to Imperial Refinery at Sarnia, Ontario, and considerable oil moved to the east coast.

We have lost the Canadian market to Canadian crude. We have lost much of the east coast market to importers and now we are in process of losing some of midwestern market to Colorado and Wyoming oils that are being sold at distressed prices.

Two years ago Texas was producing 25 days a month. It is now producing 17 days a month. Certain of our production in Oklahoma is now limited to 40 percent of what it was last September. It will only be a short time until our State finances are very badly shaken if further cuts become necessary.

Mr. Rodman's letter ably sums up the impact, direct and indirect, of foreign oil on markets for Oklahoma crude oil.

The further impairment of the oil industry in Oklahoma would be a severe blow to the State's economy, for 62 of its 77 counties produce oil. Almost 40 percent of the land in Oklahoma is under lease. Since oil was discovered in Oklahoma, it has produced more than \$10 billion worth of crude oil alone.

Oil constitutes 90 percent of the value of all mineral production in my State. Some 43,000 people are directly employed by the oil-producing industry there. The loss of markets for Oklahoma oil would obviously exert an injurious force on the economy of Oklahoma, and would result in a curtailment of employment. These are real causes for concern.

An increasing number of wells in my State are marginal in nature. This is in-

dicated by the fact that the average daily production per well in Oklahoma is 8.4 barrels. It is further evidenced by figures which show that 97 percent of all Oklahoma wells were being operated by pump or artificial lift, as of January 1, 1954.

This is not to say that Oklahoma oil is on the decline. A total of 167 new oilfields and pays were found in 1953, as compared with only 121 in 1951. This clearly indicates that Oklahoma's oil potential is still very much on the upgrade. Her added reserves will be valueless to the Nation, however, unless they are developed. And, equally important, unless a market exists for development of new reserves, the operator cannot afford to engage in expensive exploratory drilling. Projected on a national scale, this could mean a reversal in the industry's history of adding more oil to the Nation's reservoir than is found each year. This trend has continued for many years, and is more than adequate evidence that this country is definitely not, as some of the importers of oil would have us believe, running out of oil.

The oil-imports problem is not, by any means, exclusively an Oklahoma problem. It is a national problem, and one that has accelerated in postwar years. Oil imports filled only 8 percent of national demand for oil in 1946, yet now they absorb 14 percent of the United States' market. Over the same postwar period, oil imports have increased in volume from 377,000 barrels per day to their present rate well in excess of 1 million barrels per day. Oil imports have increased 179 percent during this period, while domestic crude-oil production increased only 36 percent. Thus, importation has increased at five times as fast a rate, percentage-wise, as has domestic crude-oil production. The postwar increases in domestic demand for oil have thus been supplied, to an increasing extent, by foreign oil. This has occurred in an era immediately following the domestic oil industry's tremendous contribution to victory in World War II. Continued governmental failure to protect the interests of domestic producers would be tantamount to saying, "I told you I loved you, now get out," to quote a recent popular song. This might be well and good except for the fact that we may someday need again the security that is afforded by domestic oil.

Oil produced in this country, after all, need not be protected from atomic-powered Russian submarines. It can be moved through invulnerable pipelines. Nor is it, like Iranian and other middle-eastern oil, located in an area adjoining Russia—an open invitation to conquest and exploitation. It can be utilized without the cost of lives of merchant mariners. It is not dependent on the shifting sands of international diplomacy. It can be fitted directly and immediately into the Nation's specific military needs.

Many of our military leaders have warned against the consequences of dependency on foreign sources for strategic materials. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer,

famed World War II commander of the China theater, on December 22, 1953, told Senator GEORGE W. MALONE's special Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Economics that he thought it was, and I quote, "unsound for a nation to depend upon resources of raw materials which are remote from that nation's dynamo or industrial potential." Gen. Alfred H. Johnson, then in charge of petroleum logistics for the Defense Department, told the subcommittee on December 2, 1953 that, and I again quote:

We do not desire to place any reliance on any sources outside the Western Hemisphere.

In the February 9, 1953 issue of *Newsweek*, Gen. Carl Spaatz, famed World War II Air Force leader, said:

Oil is the essential ingredient of modern warfare. Even supermodern atomic weapons amount to nothing unless the means of their delivery are fueled with oil.

Despite these warnings from experienced military men, we have continued to place increasing peacetime reliance on foreign oil. The inevitable effect of peacetime reliance is a comparable dependency in time of war. In the case of oil, this could mean disaster. Oil is the mover of military machines. It has no reliable substitute.

Senator FRANK CARLSON described this situation very well last year when he said:

If we become reliant on others for our oil supply, we must become dependent on others for security.

He also stated that—

Without petroleum, we could not even bring our men and machines into a posture of defense against our enemy. We certainly could not conduct a counteroffensive without serious and perhaps fatal early setbacks.

He pointed out that—

Oil imported from other countries during wartime would have to be protected with scarce manpower, tankers, and other equipment. If we become dependent on vast imports of oil, civilian rationing during time of war would be unlike anything ever experienced in this country before.

The oil industry recognizes the primary importance of domestic oil to defense. This policy is stated by the National Petroleum Council, industry group which advises the Federal Government on petroleum matters. This group's policy on imports is as follows:

1. The Nation's economic welfare and security require a policy on petroleum imports which will encourage exploration and development efforts in the domestic industry and which will make available a maximum supply of domestic oil to meet the needs of this Nation.

The availability of petroleum from domestic fields produced under sound conservation practices, together with other pertinent factors, provides the means for determining if imports are necessary and the extent to which imports are desirable to supplement our oil supplies on a basis which will be sound in terms of the national economy and in terms of conservation.

The implementation of an import policy, therefore, should be flexible so that adjustments may readily be made from time to time.



Imports in excess of our economic needs, after taking into account domestic production in conformance with good conservation practices and within the limits of maximum efficient rates of production, will retard domestic exploration and development of new oilfields and the technological progress in all branches of the industry which is essential to the Nation's economic welfare and security.

Despite strong voices of caution from the military, from congressional leaders and from experienced oil-industry officials, we are threatened with a larger degree of dependency on foreign oil than ever before in our history.

The oil-producing industry, in 1953, produced more than \$6 billion worth of crude oil alone. The producing industry alone employs about 300,000 people, and provides indirect employment to several times that number. Oil is now, by far, the Nation's most valuable mineral. It is found in 30 States, with good prospects for a number of additional oil-producing States in the coming years. The income from the production of oil is widely diversified, as is evident from the fact that there were more than 500,000 producing oil wells in this country at the end of 1953.

Serious injury to this industry would seriously hurt the national economy at a time when it needs all of the help it can get. The injury to susceptible State and local economies would be even more direct and immediate. When these points are coupled with the fact that the domestic industry is now capable of supplying more than adequate supplies of oil for both peace and war, a policy of increased dependency on foreign oil becomes truly incredible. Yet it is that policy which continued inaction will lead us to pursue.

In the aforementioned director's meeting of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, the productive capacity committee of that association released an analysis which showed that the domestic oil industry could have produced over one and a half million barrels per day more oil than it did in January of this year. This is "shut-in" capacity to produce, and indicates the degree to which foreign oil is restricting markets for domestic oil. This report effectively explodes the argument that we are running out of oil and that we must rely on foreign oil. The degree of reliance is a matter of national choice. This choice must be made in the best national interest. I fervently hope that such a choice will inevitably be based on the basic realization that the national security is dependent on a strong supply of domestic oil.

An even more disturbing analysis was released by the supply and demand committee of the Independent Petroleum Association of America. This committee forecast that, for the first time since 1949, the domestic producing industry would decrease, rather than increase its production in 1954. This estimate was based, however, on the assumption that there would be no change in projected imports of foreign oil during 1954.

The domestic oil producer is also faced with the loss of a substantial portion of his export market. United States exports of crude petroleum and refined products are expected to decline about 20 percent during 1954 as compared with 1953. This is a result of the fact that foreign crude oil productive capacity and refining capacity have been expanding faster than foreign demand. It has resulted in, not only the loss of a substantial part of the Western Hemisphere export market, but in an oversupply of our own domestic markets as well.

Still a third IPAA committee pointed out that the industry's costs had increased twice as fast as its revenue for the past 5 years.

Tie all of these reports together and you have a situation where the domestic oil producer's costs are going up and his markets and revenue are going down, while at the same time he is capable of producing more than he ever has before. This clearly indicates the squeeze which foreign oil is placing on domestic producers of oil. This is an incongruous and unfortunate situation from the standpoint of the national interest. A number of oil producing States have had their production allowables sharply reduced as a result of this situation.

You may ask why these States have reduced allowables to make way for foreign oil. The answer is simple. The various States, for purposes of wise conservation, have enacted statutes relating production to market demand. This prevents production in excess of market demand and avoids wasteful above-ground storage. Unfortunately, it also allows foreign oil, produced in vast quantity without similar problems of conservation, to usurp domestic markets.

The States are thus confronted with the choice of dropping a program which has again and again proven its value in conserving a valuable resource, or in keeping these conservation measures and losing their markets to foreign oil. It is an unhappy situation, from every point of view except that of the importing oil company.

Various methods have been attempted in trying to solve the oil imports problem. First, an attempt was made by domestic oil producers to point out to importers the necessity, from the national defense point of view, of a reduction in the volume of oil imports. This method was fruitless. Whether this was because of natural motivations, or pressure from the countries in which such oil is produced, or because of an over-enthusiasm as to the benefits of foreign oil, I do not know. I do know, however, that there has been no reduction of total oil imports. Quite the contrary, in fact. More important, top officials of importing oil companies have quite recently made it all too obvious that they have intentions of a far greater future importation of oil. Some of these statements are general in nature, but their meaning is nonetheless clear. Mr. B. Brewster Jennings, president of Socony-Vacuum Oil

Co., told his stockholders on April 29 that—

We in Socony-Vacuum believe that if our country will not import it cannot long export, and that the importance of our export trade to our domestic prosperity is too little appreciated.

Mr. Jennings here expresses an obvious and understandable concern for the volume of our exports, as related to his company's imports, but fails to note that oil imports exercise a direct detrimental effect on the domestic producer. Mr. Augustus C. Long, president of the Texas Co., speaking to stockholders on April 27, stated that, and I quote:

We are opposed to any additional restrictions on oil imports.

There are, as Mr. Long well knows, no effective restrictions on oil imports now. His opposition to future restrictions, coupled with the announcement by his company of a billion-dollar, 5-year expansion program, strongly suggests a long-range intention to import in larger volume. This is made further evident by the statement that—

It is our intent to support policies that will enable foreign nations to earn more dollars.

The Creole Petroleum Corp., the world's largest producing oil company, operating largely in Venezuela as a subsidiary of the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, is now active in an extensive campaign to get the public support behind added imports of foreign oil. Its president, Arthur T. Proudfoot, has, according to the May 4 issue of the *Journal of Commerce*, scheduled addresses to groups in Chicago, Detroit, Los Angeles, Seattle, and a number of other cities. Other officials of this company have scheduled appearances through the Nation. This campaign was launched at an elaborate press luncheon in New York City and the announcement was made that it would be pursued through widespread media in all parts of the country.

For further insight into the reasons for the campaign behind foreign oil, the following paragraphs from the May issue of *Petroleum Press Service*, London, England, are especially enlightening:

Surveys of United States overseas investment made by the United States Department of Commerce show oil to be the most profitable of the major industries financed by United States capital in other countries. At the beginning of 1952, United States private investments abroad in all industries totaled \$13,089 million, and produced aggregate earnings for that year of \$2,280 million, or over 17 percent. Included in these figures are those covering oil operations, in which an investment of \$3,703 million produced a profit of \$1,031 million, or 27 percent. But today's value of many of the assets used will, of course, be much higher than the original investment figure.

In view of the points delineated above, there is no apparent encouragement of hope that oil imports will be voluntarily reduced.

Attempts have also been made, through the years, to achieve reductions through the administrative branch of the Government. The interpretation

of the trade agreements program, however, has been based on international diplomatic considerations, rather than on the impact of unrestricted free trade on our high production cost economy. As a result, the State Department has actively encouraged that dollars be sent overseas for foreign oil to bolster the economies of foreign countries. This has been somewhat of a good thing for our export industries, insofar as they could lure those dollars back in exchange for their surpluses. It has not, however, been good for some of our industries, especially extractive industries, where costs are somewhat fixed by nature rather than the production line. As a result, we have strengthened our production-line industries and weakened our extractive industries. This amounts to a weakening of our basic raw materials position to the benefit of industries where manpower is the primary determinant rather than materials. It is well established that in time of war the use of manpower can be directly controlled. If, however, the capacity to produce raw materials is impaired, this capacity cannot be turned on, in time of war, like a dormant faucet. Through the years, therefore, the administration's position in this regard has been painfully shortsighted.

The recent recommendations of the Randall Commission represent an extension of this philosophy. The same thesis was contained in the Bell report and in the report of the Paley Commission. Through the years various administrations have come to bat on this question many times, and hit a number of foul balls. It is time that someone met the question squarely.

As a sidelight, perhaps typical, of administrative manipulations of the oil imports problem, I would like to reveal the following excerpt from a directive, dated April 5, 1954, of the General Services Administration. I quote:

15. Buy American exemption: The Regional Director, Region 7, General Services Administration, having been duly authorized thereunto, has determined that crude petroleum is not produced in the United States in sufficient and reasonably available commercial quantities and, therefore, has exempted from the Buy-American Act petroleum fuels and petroleum lubricants.

Truly, some of our administrative officials rush in where angels fear to tread. The conclusion that this country is not capable of producing its own needs as to petroleum is in obvious contradiction of documented facts cited earlier. I serve notice here and now that it is my intention to request that this situation be investigated, and investigated to its fullest extent. This easy distortion of the clearly established facts should not go unchallenged.

Now to turn again to the oil imports problem. It is a current one. Foreign oil is scheduled to enter the country at an average rate of about 1,100,000 barrels per day during 1954. The recent arrival in Houston of a tanker from the Middle East with 100,000 barrels of crude

oil aboard dramatizes the plight of the domestic oil producer. The 6,000-barrel per day production rate of Middle Eastern oil wells, when contrasted with the 12-barrel daily rate of the domestic oil well, makes it further obvious that the situation will continue to intensify. The emergence of Canada as a potential large-scale exporter of crude oil to the United States; the impending return of Iranian oil; the almost complete loss of the domestic oil producers' export markets; the ever-increasing volume of crude oil entering this country from Venezuela and the Middle East; the quickening volume of United States importation of Mexican crude oil; the aforementioned statements of future intentions by heads of importing oil companies; the campaign by the Creole Petroleum Corp. in behalf of added oil imports. These, and many other signposts indicate the trouble that lies ahead for the domestic oil producing industry unless it is assured a ratio of domestic peacetime markets somewhat comparable to the certain demands on the industry in time of war.

Congress can provide that assurance.

Unless there is a dramatic reversal of the philosophy of importing oil companies or of the executive branch of Government, the Congress will be the last court of resort for such a provision. It would not be the first time that Congress has so served. In 1932, the Congress passed an excise tax on oil imports. The administration of the law, under the trade agreements program, has resulted in continuous reductions in the amount of the excise tax on crude petroleum. In 1933, the year following imposition of the import tax, the rate was 21 cents per barrel or 31.3 percent of the price of crude oil at that time. In 1953, the year following the revised trade agreement with Venezuela, the tax averaged only 9.7 cents per barrel, or 3.6 percent of the average price for crude oil.

The tax is now completely ineffectual. It has been made so by administrative whittling down of wise legislative provisions, in the guise of global diplomatic considerations. The intent of Congress has thus been effectively destroyed.

The problem of oil imports has nothing to do with party lines. It is bipartisan in nature and is of vital concern to all of the people in all of the various parts of the country.

The fate of the domestic oil-producing industry may very well rest in the hands of this or the succeeding Congress. Whether oil is to add to the economy of new oil-producing States, or to detract from the economies of old ones may be the result of congressional decision.

One thing is certain. The domestic oil-producing industry cannot continue to maintain a large excessive capacity to produce, while foreign oil enters the country without the need for a similar responsibility. It cannot conserve, while foreign oil plays wastrel. It cannot exist while foreign oil acts in the role of court favorite. Something must give, and un-

less the Congress acts, it will be the domestic oil-producing industry.

This problem will surely necessitate congressional consideration in the near future. I urge that we ponder all of its aspects, and ponder them well.

#### LIBERATION AND INDEPENDENCE OF THE SLOVAK NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the annual meeting of the National Conference of Americans of Slovak Descent now taking place at the Washington Hotel in this city, I believe it is fitting and appropriate to extend recognition to the proceedings of this American body which are aimed at securing the liberation and independence of the Slovak nation and other captive nations in the primary interest of America's struggle against Communist imperialism.

I should like to bring to the attention of the Members of the House the chief excerpts from an address delivered yesterday at this conference by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor at Georgetown University and president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, entitled "Liberation, Independence, Federation." The address supports the need for a firm policy of liberation cast in the logical policy chain of independence and eventual free federation of European and Asiatic states.

What is of most serious concern are the observations made in the address on the easy Communist infiltration of what the speaker calls the totalitarian and anti-Semitic Russian organization known as the NTS. The speaker cites certain cases of this easy infiltration and suggests that the hearing of the Senate Internal Security subcommittee last week was a publicity cover-up for these disclosures of recent months engineered by interested but sorely embarrassed American supporters. He raises the question of whether the Senate subcommittee on internal security intends to hear representatives of real underground networks behind the Iron Curtain. From my own personal study, I know that there are two sides to this question. One is the Russian side and the other is the side of the millions of non-Russians who are enslaved by Russian Communist imperialism. It is certainly in the interest of the Government to hear both sides.

Under unanimous consent, I am including in my remarks excerpts from Dr. Dobriansky's stimulating address and a revealing article that appeared in the May 20 issue of America, Ukrainian Catholic organ in Philadelphia, entitled "Danger—Why NTS Cannot Be Trusted."

ADDRESS OF DR. LEV E. DOBRIANSKY

In 1952 millions of Americans voted in the great hope of seeing a moral and rational



policy of liberation launched to prevent a disastrous world war III and, at the same time, to insure the eventual defeat of Russian Communist imperialism. As of today, there isn't the slightest realization of this outstanding promise. And it cannot be expected that the people will forget.

No matter how one dresses it up verbally, the foreign policy of the United States today is still containment. The so-called policy of mass retaliation is essentially containment by threat. This retaliation version of containment is as devoid of moral principle, political and psychological inspiration, and historical perspective as the orthodox version maintained by Mr. Kennan and his well placed followers.

Dedicated to liberation and the links of independence and federation in the same policy chain, we must intensify our efforts to bring this winning policy into being. We must support those who are for this American policy, and oppose those who are against it. It is the only policy capable of obstructing the genocidal consolidation of the Communist empire in which Moscow is currently engaged. Once this consolidation is accomplished, the enemy will have established his basic and requisite position for world conquest. This consolidation is the prime ground for the enemy's reasonable expectation of success. Fortified by the advantages of a worldwide conspiracy and "the first shot," this expectation does not even require any superiority in arms. In the calculus of world conquest, consolidation, subversion, and spontaneous aggression are sufficient to produce "regionalized Pearl Harbors" devastating major sources of retaliatory effort.

Liberation is a process of political warfare aimed at the ultimate defeat of the enemy and the independence of captive nations as a necessary and logical basis for European and Asiatic reconstruction. History does not stand still. The dynamics of Western freedom and Russian Communist totalitarianism leave us no choice but to carry political warfare on the present empire terrain of the enemy. By the standards of what constitutes peace today, this action is peaceable. It demands our full, active support of the real, existing undergrounds and resistance forces in Slovakia, East Germany, Poland, Czechia, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Ukraine. These known underground forces are fighting in a political offensive to regain the very independence and self-government for their respective nations that we must fight in to preserve for our own.

Theirs is not an ersatz struggle. Last week we witnessed the spectacle of a Senate committee entertaining testimony pitched to an underground tour from the Baltic to the Mediterranean. There is a good deal of evidence to support the lack of credibility in such testimony and brazenly fabricated claims that border on insult to the intelligence of the American people. Observers are carefully watching to see whether the Jenner committee intends to call upon witnesses that represent real underground networks and who can expertly testify on the misleading and dishonest operations of the totalitarian and anti-Semitic Russian organization known as the NTS.

They are also waiting to see whether this bold spectacle before a congressional committee is nothing more than a blown, publicity cover-up—engineered by interested but sorely embarrassed American supporters—of the recent cases of heavy Communist infiltration in the group. A Russian priest and NTS leader in West Berlin, Matyslav Volonsevich, defected to the Soviets with all the addresses of his parishioners and the funds of the church. Georg Mueller, alias Georg Vladimir Khorunzky-Khersonsky, another NTS leader, was recently given a prison sentence by a United States court in Frankfurt

for operating as a Soviet spy. There is also the case of Alexander Trushnovich about whom much doubt exists concerning his being kidnapped by the Communists.

On the surface this spectacle has all the marks of a publicity cover-up tuned to the gullibility of viewers in such matters. There can be no doubt, however, that this totalitarian Russian group, which opportunistically operated with nazism as it now seeks to do with the West, is a prime target for Communist infiltration. The totalitarianism of NTS shares many things in common with the totalitarianism of Moscow, notably totalitarian great Russianism with all its racist and freedom-denying qualities. The group is the best possible breeding ground for Soviet Russian spies and, as seen in the Khersonsky case, an agency of espionage for Moscow. It scarcely deserves our trust. Even the Nazis, in the closing days of the war, saw fit to slay scores of its members.

The enlightened nationalist cause of the Slovak, Polish, Ukrainian, and other resisters certainly restricts the range of possible Russian Communist infiltration. It is based on the invincible fight for national independence and freedom from alien Russian domination. This is its consuming end, not that of substituting one form of totalitarianism with an empire complex for another with the same complex. It seeks the national independence that we Americans enjoy and are now challenged to defend.

This spirit of national independence is the full source of power and strength of the patriotic, non-Russian resister behind the Iron Curtain. It is our means of victory over Russian Communist imperialism. It is our formula of enduring peace beyond the defeat of communism. For only with real independence and equal sovereignty can the now captive nations, from the Danube to the Pacific, begin to think of entering into free contracts of federalization. The experience of Indochina should convince us that peoples fight for something rather than merely against communism.

We who are of these convictions must work tirelessly for their realization. This is our task in the great interest of our own country. To aid in this task, it is necessary for us to establish an American Conference on Foreign Affairs, consisting of American organizations such as yours, the Polish American Congress, the Ukrainian Congress Committee, and others, that would meet annually to discuss and assess our common problems. I sincerely hope that the inspiration for this will be generated here today.

[From America, Philadelphia, Pa., of May 20, 1954]

#### DANGER—WHY NTS CANNOT BE TRUSTED

For the past few months the newspapers of the free world have been replete with sensational information and reports about the NTS—a Russian emigre organization in Western Germany. Three incidents especially which occurred almost at the same time deeply moved public opinion: the escape to the Soviets of Archimandrite Matyslav Volonsevich, priest of the Russian Orthodox Church in Western Berlin, the arrest and trial by the United States authorities of Georg Mueller, alias Georg Vladimir Khorunzky-Khersonsky and escape, or kidnapping of Alexander Trushnovich in Western Berlin. Now the defection of MVD Cpt. Nikolai Evgeniyevich Khokhlov has again brought the NTS in the news.

There is no doubt that Matyslav Volonsevich escaped to the Soviets. This Russian "priest" and NTS leader in Western Berlin took all the addresses of his parishioners as well as 600 marks belonging to the parish and escaped to the Soviet sector of Berlin. However, an event of cardinal importance was the

arrest by the United States authorities in Germany of Georg Mueller, alias Georg Vladimir Khorunzky-Khersonsky, top notch Soviet spy. While spying against the American Armed Forces in Germany, Mueller operated at the same time as a leader of the NTS. He was also a professor in a school of saboteurs and intelligence agents maintained by the NTS in Bad Homburg in Germany. As a leader of prominent anti-Communist underground—NTS, he sent four intelligence agents behind the Iron Curtain whom he betrayed to the Soviets and who were caught and executed in Ukraine, in May 1953.

This case was widely reported by the newspapers. On January 22, 1954, Georg Mueller-Khorunzky-Khersonsky was convicted and sentenced by the United States court in Frankfurt to 14 years imprisonment. As to Alexander Trushnovich—another prominent leader of the NTS in Berlin—the opinion is divided. Some people think that he escaped to the Soviets, other people believe that he was kidnapped by the Soviet agents. The question as to who kidnapped whom is still not solved in Berlin, although the Soviets announced two declarations of Trushnovich stating his motives of defecting to the Soviet side.

At any case, all these incidents have prominently brought the Russian emigre organization NTS in the news. The NTS stands for the *Natsionalno-Trudovoy Soyuz* (National Labor Union). As defined by its constitution, the NTS is a Russian national movement aiming at replacing the Soviet regime with a new kind of government, called *Solidarist*. The organization claims to have originated in 1930, in Yugoslavia, but, in fact, it developed under the Nazi tutelage when the Russian *Solidarists* copied the Nazi program and made propaganda for Russian totalitarian antibolshevism and the cult of a Russian *fuehrer*. One of their ideas, then, was to reestablish in Russia a pale of Jewish settlement zones as existed under the Russian czars. In the days of General Vlassov the NTS served as an ideological front for the Himmler sponsored Russian liberation army (ROA). During the last months of Nazi power, however, neither the NTS nor the Vlassov army enjoyed the full confidence of the Nazis, as it was revealed that many NTS members were actually Soviet spies.

When the cold war between the United States and the U. S. S. R. began NTS leaders raised their heads again and began peddling their goods to the Americans. While their leaders in Europe (Victor Baidalakov and Vladimir Poremsky), both of whom served the Nazis, were doing their utmost to impress the United States authorities with their "anti-Communist technique," some of their best "technicians" were being sent to the United States. Since the fall of 1948 the NTS in the United States has been represented by Constantine W. Boldyreff, a former interpreter for the Nazis and NTS leader. He made his debut in the American scene with the publication of an article in *Look* magazine (October 26, 1948), in which he made the fantastic claim that the assassination of Sergei Kirov in Leningrad, in 1934, was engineered by the NTS. He also said that with \$100 million he could overthrow Stalin's regime with his underground NTS force. Subsequently, with the assistance of a senior editor of *Reader's Digest*, Boldyreff planted an article in this nationally esteemed American magazine where he attempted to sell his anti-Communist revolution in the U. S. S. R. for American dollars. Finally, in February of 1952, he befuddled two well-meaning and religiously inspired United States Congressmen from the Middle West into backing an NTS-inspired psychological strategy conference, which entirely failed. Robert Shaplen supported NTS whole-

heartedly in Collier's (February 23, 1952) by publishing his now famous article, *They're Sticking Stalin With a Pitchfork*. By the way, under "pitchfork" "trident" was meant—a Ukrainian national emblem which the Russian Solidarists use as their party emblem. In this article Shaplen called NTS "a shock troop of revolution." Of course, Boldyreff was not only busy with his NTS propaganda, but he also succeeded in planting several of his lieutenants in key positions in the United States: the Voice of America, the American Committee for Liberation From Bolshevism; various research teams of Columbia and Harvard Universities, and in other United States-supported Russian teams in the United States and in Germany.

There is little doubt that some of our officials have been deeply influenced by the NTS and its propaganda. The question remains: How long are we going to be fooled by them? Have we not been taught a trenchant lesson by all the Harry Dexter Whites, Gregory Silvermasters, and other Americans with Russian souls and ideology? Now, when the Bolshevik infiltration and tendency in the NTS ranks has become an indisputable fact, perhaps some of our responsible officials will put a stop to the machinations of our Russian experts and will call a halt to their naive and extremely dangerous codding of the NTS—these Janus-like Russian revolutionaries. When this happens—and only then—might we rest assured that the affair of Georg Mueller and many others of the NTS has been an effective lesson. Not for a moment should we forget that the Russian Bolsheviks and Russian Solidarists have a great deal in common: Russian nationalism and Russian imperialism—the two generating factors that have made Russia what she is today, and hence it is exceedingly easy for a Russian Bolshevik to become a Russian Solidarist and vice versa.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. CRUMPACKER.

Mr. BLATNIK in two instances.

Mr. SIEMINSKI.

Mr. RABAUT.

Mr. HESS (at the request of Mr. ARENDS).

Mr. HELLER (at the request of Mr. KLEIN).

Mr. Bow and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania.

Mr. HOWELL.

#### SENATE BILLS, A JOINT RESOLUTION, AND A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 46. An act for the relief of E. S. Berney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 885. An act to provide for the disqualifications of certain former officers and employees of the District of Columbia in matters connected with former duties; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 914. An act for the relief of Mark Vainer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 974. An act for the relief of certain Chinese children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 992. An act for the relief of Apostolos Savvas Vassiliadis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1165. An act for the relief of Paul E. Rocke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1382. An act for the relief of Elie Joseph Hamkin and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1403. An act to authorize the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia to regulate and condition the declaration and payment of dividends by public utilities in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1889. An act for the relief of Margot Goldschmidt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1900. An act for the relief of Gertrud Trindler O'Brien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1902. An act for the relief of Theresa Elizabeth Leventer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1904. An act for the relief of Otilie Theresa Workmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1959. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anne-Marie Namias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1967. An act for the relief of Paula Neumann Mahler (Paula Neumann Schibuk); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1991. An act for the relief of Esperanza Jimenez Trejo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2009. An act for the relief of Mrs. Edward E. Jex; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2172. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of veterinary medicine in the District of Columbia," approved February 1, 1907; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2654. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell certain property owned by the District of Columbia located in Montgomery County, Md., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2657. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2661. An act to regulate the sale of shell eggs in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2786. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to the southeastern interstate forest-fire protection compact; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 3103. An act to amend the act of January 12, 1951, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3137. An act to make the provisions of the act of August 28, 1937, relating to the conservation of water resources in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States, applicable to the entire United States, and to increase and revise the limitation on aid available under the provisions of said act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 3213. An act relating to the merger of the Columbus University of Washington, D. C., into the Catholic University of America, pursuant to an agreement of the trustees of said universities; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 3458. An act to authorize the long-term time charter of tankers by the Secretary of

the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. J. Res. 156. Joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America of an instrument for the amendment of the constitution of the International Labor Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation in the case of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1345. An act for the relief of John Lampropoulos;

H. R. 1705. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Jesse Bell;

H. R. 1769. An act for the relief of Mrs. Oscar F. Brown;

H. R. 1772. An act for the relief of Kenneth R. Kleinman;

H. R. 1815. An act to amend the Recreation Act of June 14, 1926, to include other public purposes and to permit nonprofit organizations to lease public lands for certain purposes;

H. R. 2022. An act for the relief of Don B. Whelan;

H. R. 2433. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Raymond Gibson, a minor;

H. R. 3041. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to Frederick W. Lee the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a certain invention;

H. R. 3109. An act for the relief of Theodore W. Carlson;

H. R. 4532. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ann Elizabeth Caulk;

H. R. 4940. An act to provide for the redemption of District of Columbia tax stamps;

H. R. 4961. An act for the relief of Mrs. James J. O'Rourke;

H. R. 4996. An act for the relief of Col. Henry M. Denning, and others;

H. R. 5772. An act for the relief of Robert E. Leibbrand, and Rose Leibbrand; and

H. R. 7786. An act to honor veterans on the 11th day of November of each year, a day dedicated to world peace.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6374. An act to revise certain laws relating to warrant officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7893. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, Export-Import Bank of Washington, and Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.



The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 26, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1569. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 17 (b) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U. S. C. 1827) (H. Doc. No. 402); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1570. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting information about a violation by a Treasury bureau of subsection (h) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, pursuant to subsection (1) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C., Sup. V665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1571. A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the semiannual stockpile report to the Congress for the period July 1 to December 31, 1953, pursuant to section 4 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, Public Law 520, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1572. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to further amend title II of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the computation of reenlistment bonuses for members of the uniformed services"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1573. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the annual report of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, together with the reports covering the operations during the same period of foreign-trade zones Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 located, respectively, at New York City, New Orleans, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Seattle, and San Antonio, pursuant to section 16 of the Foreign-Trade Zones Act of June 18, 1934, as amended by Public Law 556, 81st Congress, approved June 17, 1950; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Committee on Government Operations. Fifteenth intermediate report on Government in business; without amendment (Rept. No. 1672). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Committee on Government Operations. Sixteenth intermediate report on personnel practices of the Department of State; without amendment (Rept. No. 1673). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Committee on Government Operations. Seventeenth intermediate report on military procurement of blood-shipping containers; without

amendment (Rept. No. 1674). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 1823. An act to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during the Korean conflict, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1676). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 5958. A bill relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1677). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 8328. A bill to authorize the transmission and disposition by the Secretary of the Interior of electric energy generated at Falcon Dam on the Rio Grande; with amendment (Rept. No. 1678). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHORT: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 9242. A bill to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations and for the Alaska Communications System, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1679). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules: House Resolution 558. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 9242, a bill to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations and for the Alaska Communications System, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1680). Referred to the House Calendar.

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7886. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Cecil Norton Broy, with amendment (Rept. No. 1675). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LAIRD:  
H. R. 9267. A bill to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce, to stabilize prices of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:  
H. R. 9268. A bill to protect United States fishermen in their lawful operations on the high seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BATES:  
H. R. 9269. A bill to protect United States fishermen in their lawful operations on the high seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:  
H. R. 9270. A bill to protect United States fishermen in their lawful operations on the high seas, and for other purposes; to

the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BOYKIN:  
H. R. 9271. A bill to protect United States fishermen in their lawful operations on the high seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:  
H. R. 9272. A bill to protect United States fishermen in their lawful operations on the high seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COLMER:  
H. R. 9273. A bill to protect United States fishermen in their lawful operations on the high seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOYLE:  
H. R. 9274. A bill to protect United States fishermen in their lawful operations on the high seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HOLT:  
H. R. 9275. A bill to protect United States fishermen in their lawful operations on the high seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HOSMER:  
H. R. 9276. A bill to protect United States fishermen in their lawful operations on the high seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KING of California:  
H. R. 9277. A bill to protect United States fishermen in their lawful operations on the high seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LANE:  
H. R. 9278. A bill to protect United States fishermen in their lawful operations on the high seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LANTAFF:  
H. R. 9279. A bill to protect United States fishermen in their lawful operations on the high seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:  
H. R. 9280. A bill to protect United States fishermen in their lawful operations on the high seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:  
H. R. 9281. A bill to protect United States fishermen in their lawful operations on the high seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:  
H. R. 9282. A bill to protect United States fishermen in their lawful operations on the high seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:  
H. R. 9283. A bill to protect United States fishermen in their lawful operations on the high seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McCORMACK:  
H. R. 9284. A bill to protect United States fishermen in their lawful operations on the high seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:  
H. R. 9285. A bill to protect United States fishermen in their lawful operations on the

high seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 9286. A bill to protect United States fishermen in their lawful operations on the high seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 9287. A bill to protect United States fishermen in their lawful operations on the high seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 9288. A bill to protect United States fishermen in their lawful operations on the high seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 9289. A bill to protect United States fishermen in their lawful operations on the high seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 9290. A bill to protect United States fishermen in their lawful operations on the high seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 9291. A bill to protect United States fishermen in their lawful operations on the high seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 9292. A bill to protect United States fishermen in their lawful operations on the high seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 9293. A bill to protect United States fishermen in their lawful operations on the high seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 9294. A bill to protect United States fishermen in their lawful operations on the high seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 9295. A bill to protect United States fishermen in their lawful operations on the high seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 9296. A bill to protect United States fishermen in their lawful operations on the high seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 9297. A bill to protect United States fishermen in their lawful operations on the high seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 9298. A bill to protect United States fishermen in their lawful operations on the high seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 9299. A bill to protect United States fishermen in their lawful operations on the high seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 9300. A bill to protect United States fishermen in their lawful operations on the high seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 9301. A bill to protect United States fishermen in their lawful operations on the high seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 9302. A bill to permit retired members of the uniformed services to revoke elections made under the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of 1953 in certain cases where the elections were made because of mathematical errors or misinformation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 9303. A bill to extend the time for initiating a course of education or training under Public Law 550, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 9304. A bill to authorize and direct the Indian Claims Commission to determine the liability for the engagement in the vicinity of Wounded Knee, S. Dak., on December 29, 1890, and make recommendations in respect thereto; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 9305. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply in the case of admissions to certain rodeos; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARDY:

H. R. 9306. A bill to provide punishment for the making of false statements in any application for employment in a defense plant, or in any facility with knowledge that it is likely to become a defense plant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COON:

H. R. 9307. A bill to provide for the cooperation in financing and prosecuting early development of the John Day project on the Columbia River, Oreg. and Wash., for navigation, irrigation, flood control, and power production; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 9308. A bill authorizing the construction of certain improvements in the Rio Hondo Basin, N. Mex., for flood control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 9309. A bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, cigarettes, cigars, smoking tobacco, or chewing tobacco; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 9310. A bill to provide that the authority of the Commissioner of Education to contract for research in the field of education shall include the authority to contract for research into the narcotic-addiction problem; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 9311. A bill to strengthen the unemployment-insurance system, broaden social security, increase the minimum wage, extend tax reduction to low-income groups, provide for low-rent housing, and establish a program of public works; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:

H. R. 9312. A bill to provide for modification of the Birds Point-New Madrid floodway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 9313. A bill to amend section 204a of the Interstate Commerce Act with respect

to recovery of a reasonable counsel or attorney's fee in case of successful maintenance of an action for recovery of overcharges; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REAMS:

H. R. 9314. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to permit the employment by the Post Office Department during the month of December of annuitants under such act who are former employees of such Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 9315. A bill to provide for an extension on a reciprocal basis of the period of the free entry of Philippine articles in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 9316. A bill relating to the renewal of contracts for the carrying of mail on star routes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 9317. A bill to prohibit the transmission through the mails at less than cost of publications, books, other printed matter, and films containing material contrary to the best interests of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 9318. A bill to provide for the construction of a project for flood control protection at Huntingdon, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 9319. A bill to provide for the construction of a project for flood control protection at Smithfield Township, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 9320. A bill to provide for the construction of a project for flood control protection at Mount Union, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 9321. A bill to provide for the construction of a project for flood-control protection at Everett, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 9322. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 9 (a) so as to increase the limit of amounts payable thereunder in connection with the funeral and burial of deceased veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WARBURTON:

H. R. 9323. A bill to incorporate the American Association of Firemen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9324. A bill to incorporate the National Academy of Chefs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLVERTON (by request):

H. R. 9325. A bill to amend sections 2 (a), 6 (a), and 9 (d) of the Federal Airport Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 9326. A bill to amend section 10 (f) of the Federal Power Act to provide that charges shall be paid by Federal power projects which are benefited by stream improvements constructed by other parties, the payment to be determined in the same manner as for charges to be paid by non-Federal interests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 9327. A bill to amend the act relating to the administration of the Washington National Airport, to incorporate the Washington National Airport Corp. and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. Con. Res. 236. Concurrent resolution extending the congratulations of the Congress to Nurse Genevieve de Galard-Terraube; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs



## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 9328. A bill for the relief of Hannele Weber and her minor child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 9329. A bill for the relief of Bent Petersen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 9330. A bill for the relief of Matilde T. Bariao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 9331. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Tsolikas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 9332. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lieselotte Emilie Dailey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 9333. A bill for the relief of Erika Barbera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 9334. A bill for the relief of Walter W. Flora and Mildred L. Flora, doing business as Flora Engineering Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 9335. A bill for the relief of Grietje Visser Verhoeve Vander Molen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 9336. A bill for the relief of Marianne Geymeier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 9337. A bill for the relief of Swami Shivananda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

889. By Mrs. CHURCH: Resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Chicago urging the incorporation of the words "under God" in the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

890. By Mr. CRETILLA: Petition of Ruble Berger and others favoring the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

891. By Mr. DONDERO: Petition of citizens of Oakland County, Mich., urging favorable action by the House of Representatives of H. R. 1227, to prohibit the transportation of periodicals, letters, etc., carrying alcoholic beverages advertising in interstate commerce and to prevent its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

892. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 65 residents of Ellwood City, Pa., urging passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227, to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of alcoholic beverage advertising in newspapers, periodicals, etc., and its broadcasting over radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

893. By Mr. GARY: Petition of S. T. Dowdy and 19 other citizens of Richmond, Va., deploring the dangerous influence of sales talk for alcoholic beverages being broadcast and urging legislative prohibition of such advertising by approval of the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

894. Also, petition of Mrs. H. S. Dodge and 31 other citizens of Chester, Va., deploring the dangerous influence of sales talk for alcoholic beverages being broadcast and urg-

ing legislative prohibition of such advertising by approval of the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

895. Also, petition of Mrs. Herbert W. Phillips and 128 other citizens of Richmond, Va., deploring the dangerous influence of sales talk for alcoholic beverages being broadcast and urging legislative prohibition of such advertising by approval of the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

896. Also, petition of Harold T. Goyne and 28 other citizens of Chester, Va., deploring the dangerous influence of sales talk for alcoholic beverages being broadcast and urging legislative prohibition of such advertising by approval of the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

897. Also, petition of Mrs. E. L. Edwards and 17 other citizens of Richmond, Va., deploring the dangerous influence of sales talk for alcoholic beverages being broadcast and urging legislative prohibition of such advertising by approval of the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

898. Also, petition of Mrs. Herbert W. Phillips and 57 other citizens of Richmond, Va., deploring the dangerous influence of sales talk for alcoholic beverages being broadcast and urging legislative prohibition of such advertising by approval of the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

899. Also, petition of Mrs. A. L. Burton and 26 other citizens of Richmond, Va., deploring the dangerous influence of sales talk for alcoholic beverages being broadcast and urging legislative prohibition of such advertising by approval of the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

900. Also, petition of Miss Ida Bilger and 45 other citizens of Richmond, Va., deploring the dangerous influence of sales talk for alcoholic beverages being broadcast and urging legislative prohibition of such advertising by approval of the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

901. Also, petition of Mrs. Lucile S. Love and 32 other citizens of Chester, Va., deploring the dangerous influence of sales talk for alcoholic beverages being broadcast and urging legislative prohibition of such advertising by approval of the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

902. Also, petition of C. Roy Everett, Jr., and 26 other citizens of Richmond, Va., deploring the dangerous influence of sales talk for alcoholic beverages being broadcast and urging legislative prohibition of such advertising by approval of the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

903. Also, petition of George N. Valentine and 64 other citizens of Richmond, Va., deploring the dangerous influence of sales talk for alcoholic beverages being broadcast and urging legislative prohibition of such advertising by approval of the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

904. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. Josiah N. Walker, and 26 other citizens of Richmond, Va., deploring the dangerous influence of sales talk for alcoholic beverages being broadcast and urging legislative prohibition of such advertising by approval of the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

905. Also, petition of Mr. James R. Cope-land and 83 other citizens of Richmond, Va., deploring the dangerous influence of sales talk for alcoholic beverages being broadcast

and urging legislative prohibition of such advertising by approval of the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

906. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of 17 citizens of Wellman, Iowa, in the interest of H. R. 1227; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

907. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of Mrs. E. A. Alm and other residents of Massachusetts in support of the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

908. Also, petition of Mrs. Idella Hewin and other residents of Massachusetts in support of the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

909. Also, petition of Mr. Frank C. Seymour and other residents of Massachusetts in support of the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

910. By Mr. MASON: Petition of Mrs. Amanda B. Cleal and 29 other members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Streator, Ill., supporting the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

911. By Mr. PHILBIN: Petition of Mrs. G. L. Hazelton and others favoring the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

912. By Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Petition of Mrs. L. H. Taylor, of Lincoln, Va., and other citizens of Loudoun County, Va., in the Eighth Congressional District, in support of H. R. 1227; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

913. By Mr. STAGGERS: Petition of Wendell C. Mathias and 61 other citizens of Mathias, W. Va., and nearby communities, urging the enactment of H. R. 1227, to prohibit all liquor advertising through interstate commerce and over the radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

914. Also, petition of Vernon M. Wilkins and 38 other citizens of Moorefield, W. Va., and nearby communities, urging the enactment of H. R. 1227, to prohibit all liquor advertising through interstate commerce and over the radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

915. By Mr. TABER: Petition of Olive O. Hammer and others favoring the Bryson bill H. R. 1227; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

916. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Joseph Prime and others, Brooklyn, N. Y., relative to being in support of House Joint Resolution 243, to incorporate the words "under God" in the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

917. Also, petition of Arthur R. Somers and others, Brooklyn, N. Y., relative to being in support of House Joint Resolution 243, to incorporate the words "under God" in the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

918. Also, petition of Edward J. McCann and others, Brooklyn, N. Y., relative to being in support of House Joint Resolution 243, to incorporate the words "under God" in the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

919. Also, petition of Lawrence Lohrer and others, Valley Stream, N. Y., relative to being in support of House Joint Resolution 243, to incorporate the words "under God" in the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

920. Also, petition of Joseph Sulenski and others, Maspeth, N. Y., relative to being in support of House Joint Resolution 243, to incorporate the words "under God" in the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.